

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
AND
PRIVACY ACTS**

**SUBJECT: COMMUNIST INFILTRATION-MOTION
PICTURE INDUSTRY(COMPIC) (EXCERPTS)**

FILE NUMBER: 100-138754

SERIAL:1003 (part 2)

PART: 9 OF 15



FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

IV. COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN MOTION PICTURES

As a preface to this section, it should be pointed out that it has not been a function of this Bureau to review motion picture productions for political content for it was not believed that the Bureau's representatives are experts in this field nor was it believed that censorship of motion pictures was within the purview of the activities of the Bureau. Our investigation of Communism in Hollywood has for the most part been directed toward the investigation of the individual Communists, Communist front organizations, Communist infiltration of the labor groups and the general activities of the Communist Party in the Los Angeles area. However, in conjunction with our investigations, reports have been received from Confidential Informants and other sources concerning the tactics used by the Communists in their attempt to influence motion pictures and actual examples of Communist propaganda in motion picture films. This data will be set out in this section.

Background and Tactics Used by the Communists to Inject Communist Propaganda in the Motion Pictures

As has been pointed out in Section I of this memorandum, an article in the Daily Worker for August 15, 1925, was written by Willy Muenzenberg, the German Communist propagandist, in which he quotes Vladimir Ilitch Lenin as stating with regard to the motion picture:

"You must powerfully develop film production, taking especially the proletarian kino (motion picture theatres) to the city masses, in still a much greater extent to the village. You must always consider that of all the arts the motion picture is for us the most important."

Likewise Muenzenberg quoted Gregory E. Zinoviev, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in 1925, as stating:

"The motion picture in the possession of the bourgeoisie is the strongest means for the portrayal and befuddling of the masses. In our hands, it can and must become a mighty weapon of Communist propaganda and further enlightenment of the widest working masses."

With the preceding quotations set out to show the importance placed upon the motion picture by leaders of the Communist International, it is readily understandable how in 1935 the top structure of the Communist Party, USA, according to Confidential Informant [REDACTED] of the Los Angeles Office, set down instructions to the Communist Party in the Los Angeles area to concentrate their activities on the motion picture industry, specifically requesting that they concentrate on the so-called intellectual groups which are composed of directors, writers, actors and high-paid technicians.

According to [redacted] the Communist Party has continued its program of concentrating on the writers and directors in the motion picture industry for the purpose of injecting propaganda into the motion pictures. These writers and directors are in a position in the creative field to determine the content of the picture. The writer who creates a dialogue and the director who interprets the same are in a position to influence political feeling contained in any given picture. For this reason, [redacted] has stated, the political views and background of the writer and director in the motion picture industry are utilized to the fullest extent by the Communist Party. This has resulted in the infiltration of known Communists and fellow travelers into the writers' and directors' groups.

[redacted] has related that World War II permitted those writers and directors who acted under Communist guidance to insert sequences and episodes into a picture in a most clever manner. For this reason, he related, the Communist apparatus in the motion picture industry has been most successful, having placed in the majority of war pictures those writers and directors who were in sympathy with the cause of Communism. [redacted] stated that the crowning achievement in this respect was the picture "Mission to Moscow".

[redacted] has related that this picture raised such a controversy throughout the United States it was necessary that the Communist technique be changed. He related that the Communists then decided that the Communist writers and directors must become more subtle. He stated they are now content to insert a line, a sentence or a situation carrying the Communist Party line into an otherwise non-political picture, having found that this method is more effective by reason of the fact that it does not appear to be purposeful but just incidental. He related that this subtle method of getting propaganda into the pictures was not restricted to war-type pictures or serious drama. He stated that the Communist message was also conveyed in the so-called "musicals".

He also related the Communists, in influencing the production of these pictures, do not only direct their efforts at injecting propaganda into the pictures, but also prevent all material that the Party might consider objectionable to its current program from appearing in pictures. It has been reported that on several instances the Communist element has actually prevented the making of certain pictures.

Among the pictures of this type, according to [redacted] was "Uncle Tom's Cabin", written from the book by Harriet Beecher Stowe. Production of this picture was particularly attacked by elements of the Communist Party due to the fact that it was felt that the picture did not reflect a proper attitude on the part of the negroes. As a result of this pressure, this

picture was withdrawn. Another picture, "The Life of Eddie Rickenbacker" met similar pressure. The Communist Party objected to him because of his expressed political opinions regarding labor. He was labeled as a Fascist, a Nazi sympathizer, a reactionary and an isolationist. Pressure was said to have been put on a number of film stars to refuse leading roles in the picture. It was also said that a number of writers were threatened causing some of them to refuse to do the script. This again resulted in the picture being withdrawn from production.

[REDACTED] who is a screen writer at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, has related that a group of motion picture writers, producers and directors who are aware of the Communist activity within the motion picture industry, had assembled considerable information setting forth the purposes and aims of the Communists in connection with the production of motion pictures. Among those who had done this were: James McGuinness, and Ayn Rand, screen writers; Robert Arthur, producer; Mrs. Robert Arthur and Morris Rykskind, free-lance screen writers as well as Lela Rogers, screen writer and producer. There is set out hereinafter the purpose of the Communists in Hollywood according to the information assembled by this group:

"The purpose of the Communists in Hollywood is not the production of political movies openly advocating Communism. Their purpose is to corrupt non-political movies by introducing small casual bits of propaganda into innocent stories and to make people absorb the basic premises of Collectivism by indirection and implication. Few people would take Communism straight, but a constant stream of hints, lines, touches, and suggestions battering the public from the screen will act like drops of water that split a rock if continued long enough. The rock that they are trying to split is Americanism".

This group has also prepared a list of some of the more common devices used by the Communists to disseminate their propaganda. They include the smearing of the free enterprise system, the smearing of industrialists, presenting of wealth as evil, presenting of success as evil, glorification of failure, glorifying depravity, glorifying collectivism, smearing the independent man and belittling of American political institutions.

In addition to the above, this group has pointed out that it is the Communist aim never to show the Soviet form of government or Soviet policies in an unfavorable light. According to [REDACTED] only 25% of a screen story has to be written by a particular screen writer to obtain the screen credits for writing the screen play. Consequently other writers, according to these sources, particularly Communists, can work on a motion picture script and their identity would not become publicly known.

As an additional indication of the influence to which members of the Screen Writers Guild were subjected, the following quotation is being set out. This quotation was taken from the Hollywood Reporter dated August 20, 1946, and is a statement made by John Howard Lawson at a "Party Line Indoctrination Center" to a young group of student actors.

"Unless you portray any role given you in a manner to further the Revolution and the Class War, you have no right to call yourself an artist or an actor... You must do this regardless of what the script says or of what the director tells you. Even if you are nothing more than an extra, you can portray a society woman in a manner to make her appear a villainess and a snob. And you can portray a working girl in such a way so as to make her seem a sympathetic victim of the capitalist system. It is your duty to do this at whatever studio you may find yourself employed."

In addition to the foregoing data, it must also be pointed out that the Communists' strategy and tactics included the use of the Aesopian language to disseminate and propagate their Communist ideologies. In other words, the Communists will use such words as Fascism or Democracy not in the same fashion as a true American. We understand as the meaning of Fascism, the type of government under Hitler and Mussolini, whereas the Communists in using the term Fascism mean any political action or word which is contrary to the Soviet Union. When we refer to a democratic government, we mean a true democracy as we have in the United States today, whereas the Communists in using the term democracy as applied to a form of government mean a government under the control of the State, free from capitalism and free enterprise which can only be possible in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The use of this type of veiled propaganda utilized by the Communists may also be injected into motion picture films by the Communists and Communist sympathizers active in the writing and production of motion picture films.

Analysis of Motion Pictures Disclosing Communist Propaganda Therein

"KEEPER OF THE FLAME"

Released by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer on February 5, 1943
Producer -- Victor Saville
Associate Producer -- Leon Gordon
Director -- George Cukor
Screen Play -- Donald Ogden Stewart
(Based upon a novel by I.A.R. Wylie)
Cast -- Starring Spencer Tracy and Katherine Hepburn

The author of the screen play, Donald Ogden Stewart, has been identified by Confidential Informant [REDACTED] former editor of the Daily Worker and associate of National functionaries of the Communist Party, as a Communist. In addition, Howard DeSilva, the actor, is a member of the supporting cast of this film and he has been identified as a Communist in Section I.

Katherine Hepburn, according to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] has been associated with Communist inspired or directed activities in the Hollywood area. [REDACTED] made available a portion of the script of this picture which is taken from the opening scene. Christine is played by Katherine Hepburn and Steve by Spencer Tracy. Immediately preceding the scenes depicted in this script, Christine was married to a successful doctor but let him go to his death by driving into a washed-out bridge when she could have prevented his death. Christine is attempting to explain to Steve why she let her husband go to his death:

"Steve: I can believe in you so much that you can't help yourself. You'll have to be what I believe you are.

"Christine: (softly) I have been wanting to talk to you since that first night you came. I can fight you no longer. (after a moment) I married a legend--a legend about a hero. I didn't know that at first. I worshipped Robert. Perhaps to worship anyone is to destroy them. Everybody worshipped him--no, the image of him, the image that had been carefully built up in people's minds, deliberately built up I now believe, built up with a terrible purpose. When I found out what that purpose was I had to destroy the image. No, I had to destroy the man to save the image. Yes, that was it.

"Steve: What terrible purpose?

"Christine: I didn't know it was terrible once. You heard his mother this afternoon.

"Steve: His mother is insane.

"Christine: But Robert wasn't. He really believed in Hitler's new order.

"Steve: Robert Forrest!

"Christine: He had come to despise the people who worshipped him--all of us. (as Steve looks at her) Yes, me too. We were all beneath him. I didn't know what had happened. I suppose I was a bit like

that myself. I believed in a few. Leaders. Rulers. And then, as Robert began to change, I saw the face of Fascism in my own home. Hatred. Arrogance. Cruelty. I saw what German women were facing. I saw the enemy.

*Steve: Robert Forrest.

*Christine: On the morning of the accident, I stole his keys, came here and opened this. (she moves to an enormous, specially-built filing cabinet) This what I found. (as she speaks, she throws open the doors of the cabinet and we see a well-ordered array of drawers, cubby-holes, etc., containing papers, long lists of alphabetically indicated documents) Here is the key to Robert Forrest's Fascist organization. (she presses a button and a secret drawer jumps out) Of course, they didn't call it Fascism--they painted it red, white and blue and called it Americanism. (she takes out an ominous bunch of stocks and bonds) These are the funds to see it through. (she hands a stack of unnegotiable bonds to Steve) a fantastic amount subscribed by a few men to whom money meant nothing any more, but who wanted political power and knew they could never get it by democratic means. (she takes a card from an index) Here are their names. (Steve takes the card, glances at it, puts it in his pocket. Christine turns back to the cabinet) But what really sickened me was the essence of their plan. Here are some articles -- (from a drawer she pulls out a stack of typed manuscripts) all ready for release, to stir up the little hatreds of the hole nation against each other. (she hands Steve the first article) This is the copy of an article to be used in an anti-Semitic paper attacking the Jews. (she hands Steve the second article) This was to be used in the Farmers Gazette to stir them up against the city dwellers. (handing him another article) Here is an article to stir up hatred against the Catholics..(she gives him still another article) This is anti-negro...(handing him another article) This is against trade unions..(she gives him still another page) This is a subtle appeal to the Klu Klux Klan.

Steve examines each of the papers as she gives them to him. She goes back to the cabinet and produces more evidence.

*Christine: This is an interesting list of newspaper editors who had either sought public office in vain or had sought to dictate who would occupy office, and because they didn't succeed believed that the people were a great, stupid beast.

(while Steve is glancing at this paper, she turns back and runs her finger over the card index in a long drawer as she speaks) These were men who served their country in the last war but who were failures in business, who again longed for the power of rank and the prestige of a uniform (she presses a button, which opens a spring door in the cabinet. She lifts out a small book) This contains the names and addresses of the men who were designated to be America's first storm troopers. (Steve's face hardens as he takes the book and shoves it into his pocket grimly) But what shocked me the most was the complete cynicism of the plan! Each of these groups was merely to be used until its usefulness was exhausted. Hates were to be played against hates. When one group seemed to be getting too powerful, it would be killed off with another group. And in the end all these poor little dupes who never realized to what purpose they were lending themselves would be in the same chains, cowed and enslaved, with Robert Forrest and his handful of power-thirsty henchmen cracking the whip."

Accordint to [REDACTED] who is [REDACTED] at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, this is a good example of the negative approach and the indirect tactics used by the Communist writers in getting across the Communist Party line. He stated that in this script the writer has, in a veiled manner, attempted to make the audience believe that Fascism and Americanism are synonymous.

"THE MASTER RACE"

Producer -- Robert Golden
Writer and Director -- Herbert Biberman
Collaborators with Biberman -- Anne Froelich
Rowland Leigh
Cast included -- Morris Carnovsky
Lloyd Bridges

The Director and script writer, Herbert Biberman, is identified in Section I, of this memorandum, as a Communist. Anne Froelich, who collaborated with Biberman, is also identified in Section I of this memorandum as a Communist. Actors Lloyd Bridges and Morris Carnovsky have also been identified by most reliable and very delicate sources as Communists and their Communist connections are set out in Section I.

This picture was reviewed on February 14, 1945, by three Agents of the Los Angeles Office who were well schooled in Communist investigations and Communist Party propaganda. After reviewing this picture, they independently wrote reviews setting forth their opinions as to the Communist propaganda set out in the picture. A summary of their opinions is set out below.

In the first instance, the character, Colonel Von Beck, the German underground leader, was created and depicted as possessing all of the detested qualities attributed to the German race. The Major Phillip Carson, the American Army officer in charge of the liberated town of Kolar was depicted as a man and officer of very mediocre abilities. The British officer, Captain Forsyth, was depicted as being far below Major Carson in abilities and radiated weakness in all of his activities, whereas Lt. Andrei Krestov of the Russian Army was depicted as a superman in physical appearance and ability. He was shown as possessing ability to perform any type of task assigned to him and as being a real leader. A second example which appeared to contain propaganda was a series of scenes intended to give the impression that religious freedom exists in Russia. One of the scenes reflected that the young German officer was surprised to learn that religion was permitted in Russia. He appeared to be haunted by the vision of having thrown a hand grenade upon the alter of a church in the Ukraine. The main theme of the story was to establish unity of the United Nations in war and peace, which, of course, was the Communist Political Association line at the time this picture was produced. This is a praiseworthy theme, but it has particular significance when it is realized that the writer, Biberman, is a former active leader of the American Peace Mobilization in Hollywood and later, with the change in Soviet policy, called for all out unity.

"NORTH STAR"

Released by RKO Pictures, Inc. on October 14, 1943

Producer -- Samuel Goldwyn

Associate Producer -- William Cameron Menzies

Director — Lewis Milestone

Author == Lillian Hellman

Screan play -- Lillian Hellman

Cast: Starring -- Anne Baxter Dana Andrews

Walter Houston

Waiter August
Jesse Williams

The author and writer of the screen play for this production, Lillian Hellman, has been identified by [REDACTED] Confidential Informant of the New York Office, as a Communist. In addition, Confidential Informant [REDACTED] of the Los Angeles Office has reported that Hellman is a high ranking Communist who has associated exclusively with known Communists and Communist sympathizers for the past 30 years.

Lewis Milestone, the Director, according to [REDACTED]
has associated with known Communists and Communist sympathizers.

Also, in the supporting cast is Ruth Nelson, actress, who is identified in Section I as a Communist.

In conjunction with this picture, it should be pointed out that [REDACTED] the ex-secretary of Samuel Goldwyn, well-known motion picture producer, and presently the wife of [REDACTED] producer, indicated that she was closely associated with the detail involved in the production of this picture. She related that Samuel Goldwyn had attempted to delete much of the obvious propaganda which was originally injected into this film. However, he was unable to take all of it out. This source reported that in addition to the giving of a fictitious picture of the situation in Russia, the film portrayed the idea that collective farming was the only successful way to farm.

"PRIDE OF THE MARINES"

Released by Warner Brothers on August 7, 1945
Producer -- Jerry Wald
Director -- Delmar Daves
Author -- Roger Butterfield
Screen play -- Albert Maltz
Adaptation -- Marvin Borowsky
Cast: Starring -- John Garfield
 Eleanor Parker

Albert Maltz, writer of the screen play has been identified in Section I as a Communist. In addition, John Garfield, leading actor in the motion picture, has been identified as a Communist.

According to [REDACTED] Jack Koffitt, who wrote a review of this film in the Hollywood Review of September 10, 1943, is alert to the Communist tactics in the motion pictures and admitted this picture which was entertaining and well done, had Communist propaganda injected into it by the author. The following quotation is taken from Koffitt's article:

"Unfortunately, the soap box hasn't been completely eliminated. In one sequence Mr. Daves and Mr. Maltz have dragged the old Party Line into their love story about as gracefully as if they were

lugging a dead bear up a flight of stairs into a boudoir. They say everythin' they can think of to provoke doubts concerning representative government and the free enterprise system. Employers are accused of ever,thing from racial prejudice to a conspiracy to scuttle the G.I. Bill of Rights. The screen should be used as a forum for public discussion. But there is a great deal of difference between honest argument and biased propaganda. There should be, as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once put it, 'A free trade in ideas' so that the public can choose what is best in 'the competition of the open market'. That is the theory behind the American constitution. In the scene I refer to, many accusations are hurled which the other side gets no chance to answer. It represents, not a discussion, but a monopoly of ideas."

"SONG TO REMEMBER"

Released by Columbia Pictures, Inc., January 8, 1945
Producer -- Louis F. Edelman
Director -- Charles Vidor
Author -- Ernst Marischka
Screen Play -- Sidney Buchman
Cast: Starring -- Paul Muni
Merle Oberon
Cornel Wilde

The author of the screen play, Sidney Buchman, a well-known screen writer, has been identified in Section I of this memorandum as a Communist.

[REDACTED] made the following remarks with regard to Communist propaganda injected into this picture, "Song to Remember":

"This motion picture represents a subtle complete distortion of historical facts. It deals with the life of Chopin. Chopin escapes from Poland and works in the underground against Russia during the revolutionary period in 1917. He further flees to Paris where he becomes acquainted with a rich woman who feels sorry for him because he is poor and ill. She takes him in and encourages him to study and compose music so that he may make something of himself and gain material wealth. Chopin's friends from Poland contact him and ask him to stop his work of composing and go on a tour and collect money which is to be donated to the people for the people's causes. They accuse him of being selfish.

"The rich woman who befriended Chopin is pictured as very evil. The picture deals much with the individual rights as against the rights of the masses. Chopin is convinced he must go to work for the people so he gives up his desire to carry on his work from Paris and goes on a tour where he becomes more ill and finally dies.

"The chief propaganda in addition to the above is that the man has no rights for himself but should live for the people and particularly persons of prominence like Chopin should even give his life for the masses so as to lead inspiration for them instead of gaining fame or glory for himself."

According to Mrs. [REDACTED] formerly associated with RKO Studios who is an independent writer and producer, Artur Rubinstein, the well-known pianist was known to have protested to Harry Cohen, head of Columbia Pictures due to the fact that the production distorted the fact. Cohen informed Rubinstein that very few of the American people would know the difference and he thought the picture would make money.

"THE BEST YEARS OF OUR LIVES"

Released by Samuel Goldwyn through RKO Pictures, Inc. On
December 25, 1946

Producer — Samuel Goldwyn
Director — William Wyler
Screen play — Robert Sherwood
(From the novel Glory for Me by Mackinlay Kantor)
Cast: Starring — Myrna Loy
 Frederic March
 Dana Andrews

According to [REDACTED] the writer of this screen play, although not known to be definitely a Communist, was one who associated with them and frequently gave them aid and comfort. It was pointed out by these individuals that this was a good example of a picture in which the screen credits did not reflect any outstanding or well-known Communists as associated with the production of the picture but it was believed by these individuals that the script was "dressed" by Communist writers who did not receive screen credits. According to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Howard Koch had done some of the work as a writer on this script. Koch is believed by [REDACTED] to be a Communist.
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Frederic March, one of the starring actors in this play, has been identified by Confidential Informant [REDACTED] as a Communist.

Roman Bohnen and Howland Chamberlain, both of whom are identified in Section I of this memorandum as Communists, were included in the supporting cast.

The publication "Plain Talk," in the April, 1947, issue, carried an article written by William Markham in which Markham pointed out that this picture contained Communist propaganda which was subtly injected into the film. It was referred to as a masterpiece of "subversive half-truth."

[REDACTED] Paramount Studios, in discussing the picture "The Best Years of Our Lives," stated the picture portrayed the upper class in a bad light. He recalled that the banker was portrayed as a mean, avaricious individual. One scene which [REDACTED] discussed as illustrating his point occurred when Frederic March went to see his boss, the banker, to tell the latter that he, March, had made a loan to a GI. Once March turned away, the banker's face changed and he registered disapproval of the former's action. This tended to show the banker as a mean individual. In the picture, according to [REDACTED] March attacked the banker at a public meeting, which tends to give the audience the impression that bankers as a class are evil. [REDACTED] related that other unnecessary "stuff" was also put in.

William Z. Foster, national leader of the Communist Party, USA, held a meeting on September 10, 1947, in a Los Angeles Hotel with California State Secretary William Schneiderman and Los Angeles County Communist Party Chairman Ned Sparks. Agents of the Los Angeles Office [REDACTED] heard Foster, in speaking of current motion picture productions, state with regard to the motion picture "The Best Years of Our Lives," "That was real stuff." He referred to this picture as well as "The Farmer's Daughter" and "Crossfire," which are also discussed in this Section, by stating, "They are standing them on their ears." Foster indicated that all three of these pictures were very fine productions.

"IT'S A WONDERFUL LIFE"

Released by RKO Pictures, Inc. on December 19, 1946.

Producer -- Frank Capra

Director -- Frank Capra

Screen play -- Frances Goodrich, Albert Hackett, Frank Capra

Cast: Starring -- James Stewart

Donna Reed

Lionel Barrymore

According to Informants [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in this picture the screen credits again fail to reflect the Communist support given to the screen writers. According to [REDACTED] the writers Frances Goodrick and Albert Hackett were very close to known Communists and on one occasion in the recent past while these two writers were doing a picture for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Goodrick and Hackett practically lived with known Communists and were observed eating luncheon daily with such Communists as Lester Cole, screen writer, and Earl Robinson, screen writer. Both of these individuals are identified in Section I of this memorandum as Communists.

With regard to the picture "It's A Wonderful Life", [REDACTED] stated in substance that the film represented a rather obvious attempt to discredit bankers by casting Lionel Barrymore as a "scrooge-type" so that he would be the most hated man in the picture. This, according to these sources, is a common trick used by Communists.

In addition, [REDACTED] stated that, in his opinion, this picture deliberately maligned the upper class, attempting to show the people who had money were mean and despicable characters. [REDACTED] related that if he had made this picture portraying the banker, he would have shown this individual to have been following the rules as laid down by the State Bank Examiners in connection with making loans. Further, [REDACTED] stated that the scene wouldn't have "suffered at all" in portraying the banker as a man who was protecting funds put in his care by private individuals and adhering to the rules governing the loan of that money rather than portraying the part as it was shown. In summary, [REDACTED] stated that it was not necessary to make the banker such a mean character and "I would never have done it that way".

[REDACTED] recalled that approximately 15 years ago, the picture entitled "The Letter" was made in Russia and was later shown in this country. He recalled that in this Russian picture, an individual who had lost his self-respect as well as that of his friends and neighbors because of drunkenness, was given one last chance to redeem himself by going to the bank to get some money to pay off a debt. The old man was a sympathetic character and was so pleased at his opportunity that he was extremely nervous, inferring he might lose the letter of credit or the money itself. In summary, the old man made the journey of several days duration to the bank and back with no mishap until he fell asleep on the homeward journey because of his determination to succeed. On this occasion the package of money dropped out of his pocket. Upon arriving home, the old man was so chagrined he hung himself. The next day someone returned the package of money to his wife saying it had been found. [REDACTED] draws a parallel of this scene and that of the picture previously discussed, showing that Thomas Mitchell who played the part of the man losing the money in the Capra picture suffered the same consequences as the man in the Russian picture in that Mitchell was too old a man to go out and make money to pay off his debt to the banker.

"THE FARMER'S DAUGHTER"

Released by RKO Pictures, Inc., on May 6, 1947

Starring: Loretta Young
Joseph Cotten
Ethel Barrymore

[REDACTED] an independent writer and producer, previously referred to in this section of the memorandum, related that the Communist propaganda in this picture was undoubtedly condoned by Dore Schary, producer, whom [REDACTED] knows personally and with whom she has had numerous arguments concerning the Communist form of government. Schary, according to [REDACTED] instructed at the People's Educational Center, a Communist influenced school previously discussed in this memorandum. According to Informant [REDACTED] Schary has been a close follower of the Communist Party line for a considerable number of years. In referring to the picture, [REDACTED] stated in substance that it was an obvious attempt to belittle present Congressional form of government in this country.

William Mooring, in an article entitled "From the Hollywood Sets" appearing in the National Catholic Monthly magazine issue of August, 1947, stated with regard to the picture, "The Farmer's Daughter", the underlying effect of the film, viewed as one of the steady diets of such things, is to throw mud at the political factions known to oppose Communism, and furthermore, at the same time without naming the "Progressive" Party whose politics it upholds. It leaves with us the thought that only those who, like the farmer's daughter, believe in the naturalization of the banking system and other familiar tenets of Communism, are honest or humanitarian.

[REDACTED] in referring to this picture, advised that he did not believe it contained any direct Communist ideology. He stated it exposed the crooked dealings of the upper class in politics and that it showed the complete control by political methods of a wealthy family in a community. [REDACTED] stated that it was tempered, however, and that this family was not shown as a vicious one.

"CROSSFIRE"

Released by RKO Pictures, Inc., June, 1947

Producer -- Adrian Scott
Director -- Edward Dmytryk
Screen play -- John Paxton
(Adapted from novel "The Brick Foxhole")
Starring: Robert Young

The producer of this picture is Adrian Scott and the Director Edward Dmytryk, both of whom are identified in Section I of this memorandum as Communists.

According to Informants [redacted] and [redacted] this picture is a good example in which the racial angle has been unduly emphasized. In a report prepared by the Southern California Motion Picture Council, Inc., which is a known non-commercial, non-political, and non-sectarian group of organizations which furnish representatives to review motion pictures as they are released and make certain recommendations, the following information is disclosed concerning "Crossfire":

"This picture is near treasonable in its implications and seeming efforts to arouse race and religious hatred, through mis-leading accusations; the use of a drunken, mal-adjusted soldier to typify our courageous service men and the use of minority groups to arouse suspicion and sympathy. This country was founded for religious freedom and has ever been the haven of security for the oppressed and persecuted of all nations. Here they have found peace, security and prosperity under just and equitable laws. Any effort to arouse class consciousness or antagonism is un-American; morally unsound; a perversion of facts and a seeming effort to create pernicious propaganda against unity and peace. It could have been a great picture, had the message of love instead of hate been consummated but it missed the mark, because one group was presented as intolerant, cruel and murderous, when all classes involved were to blame. The technical qualities are excellent. The photography is unusual. The opening scenes and music, which was impressive throughout, create an atmosphere of impending doom. The story, a complex murder mystery, involves four service men, Keeley, Montgomery, Mitchell, Floyd and Samuels, a Jew. The picture is socially and morally unsound and cannot be commended for any audience."

[redacted] President of this organization, stated that in this picture one race is placed against another. [redacted] has advised with regard to this picture that certain of the speeches made by the actors were changed on the set and did not show up in the script. Specifically, he stated that a speech made by Robert Young in which he stated, "Jews have been killed, Catholics have been killed, that is the history of America", was altered on the set by the addition of the last phrase "that is the history of America".

It is of interest to point out that the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker for August 31, 1947, in the column entitled "The Movies" by Harold J. Salemson, indicates that the Daily Worker has taken the stand that the picture "Crossfire" is "a fine document against intolerance....It seems to us that the unconscious and semi-conscious anti-semites are reacting very violently. The film MUST be hitting its mark..."

"BRUTE FORCE"

Released by United Artists, July, 1947
Producer -- Mark Hellinger
Director - Jules Dassin
Screen play -- Richard Brooks
Starring: Burt Lancaster
Hume Cronyn
Charles Bickford

The director of this production, Jules Dassin, has been identified as a Communist in Section I of this memorandum.

Life Magazine dated August 11, 1947, in reviewing this picture pointed out that it was a picture with some good acting in it but "less praiseworthy is a turn about moral code which portrays each representative of law and order almost as a case history of depravity, while all the law breakers seem like real nice fellows". A review made by the California Congress of Parents and Teachers of Los Angeles, California, in the publication "Unbiased Opinions" reflected the following information concerning the film.

"The characters portraying the officers are as follows: the Captain of the guard is a Hitler type; the warden is a weakling holding on for retirement; the prison doctor is a humanitarian who can endure the suffering he sees only by using drink as a narcotic."

The review in this periodical by the California Federation of Business and Professional Clubs, states in part as follows:

"Socially, it is insidious for sympathy, (it) is directed toward criminals while officers pledged to uphold the law are presented as cruel, vicious, and sadistic."

[REDACTED] a confidential source of the Los Angeles Office who is an independent motion picture producer releasing through Universal-International Studios, reported that during the making of "Brute Force", Jules Dassin, the director, attempted to insert a scene which in [REDACTED] opinion was Communist propaganda. Dassin intended showing negroes and whites occupying the same cells and intended depicting some sort of strife between the races. According to [REDACTED] this plan of Dassin was contrary to established prison regulations and practices as explained by his technical director. [REDACTED] related he had a conference with Dassin, instructing him to throw out this scene and to follow his instructions specifically as to the relationship between the white and negro races.

"MISSION TO MOSCOW"

Released by Warner Brothers, May, 1943
Producer — Robert H. Buckner
Technical Director: Jay Leyda
Screen Play — Erskine Caldwell
Author — Joseph E. Davies

"Mission to Moscow", a Warner Brothers release of May, 1943, was produced by Robert H. Buckner. Buckner was a former correspondent in Moscow of the "London Daily Mail". According to [redacted] he selected J. Leyda to act as technical director for the picture. Leyda had been in Moscow at the same time as Buckner where he had been connected with the Bureau of Revolutionary Writers of the Soviet Motion Picture Industry. Leyda is identified in Section I of this memorandum as a Communist. He was also active in the League of American Writers, a Communist front group.

[redacted] has related that the actual writer of the screen play "Mission to Moscow" was Erskine Caldwell. Caldwell has been a member of the League of American Writers for many years. He also made several trips to the Soviet Union. At one time, he was associate editor of "Soviet Russia Today", a Soviet propaganda publication. Prior to August, 1939, he was in favor of a collective security. During the life of the Hitler-Stalin Non-Aggression Pact, he supported the program of the American Peace Mobilization and openly opposed Lend-Lease and Selective Service. After June 22, 1941, which was the date that the Soviet Union was invaded by the Nazis, he called for all-out aid to Britain, Soviet Russia and China.

The picture, "Mission to Moscow" is based upon the book, "Mission to Moscow" written by former United States Ambassador to Russia, Joseph E. Davies. The pro-Soviet propaganda disseminated through this picture was so obvious that it was criticized by numerous newspapers on these grounds. Informant [redacted] related the picture caused a controversy which resulted in the Communist Party's changing its technique of inserting Communist propaganda into motion pictures.

"CASS TIMBERLANE" -
Written by — Donald Ogden Stewart

Donald Ogden Stewart has been identified by Confidential Informant [redacted] of the New York Office as a Communist. According to Informant [redacted] Stewart has been affiliated with the Communist element in the

motion picture industry for many years. [redacted] related that the captioned film is an example of distortion of facts. He related that the script deals with the "country club set" attempting to get government war contracts. Considerable effort on the behalf of this group was expended to maneuver Judge Timberlane out of town as he is represented as being an honest Judge, the inference being that there are dishonest judges and this one was an exception. [redacted] related that furthermore this judge was pictured as a State judge when in reality a judge dealing with war contract cases should have been a Federal judge. Also this judge would have disqualified himself in connection with the trial in question.

According to [redacted] this picture, which has not as yet been released, is to be made available to the public in the immediate future.

"BUCK PRIVATES COME HOME"

Screen play -- Frederick Rinaldo
Starring -- Bud Abbott
Lou Costello

The screen writer, Frederick Rinaldo, has been identified in Section I of this memorandum as a current member of the Communist Party in the Los Angeles area.

According to [redacted] in the picture "Buck Privates Come Home", one scene portrays a party given for a General in the Army whereas intermingling scenes disclose an enlisted man on KP duty making the audience unnecessarily class conscious. In other scenes he depicts an enlisted soldier who remarks he is unable to go to the nurses quarters and makes the statement that enlisted men cannot go out with officers, the nurse in this case being an officer.

"TIME OF YOUR LIFE"
Screenplay -- William Saroyan
Producer -- James Cagney

This picture is cited as an example of the rejection of anti-Communist propaganda, which was displayed at a session of the Arts, Sciences and Professions Conference of the Progressive Citizens of America held on thought control at the Beverley Hills Hotel on July 12, 1947. This meeting was attended by an Agent of the Los Angeles Office who related that the session was dominated by known Communists with the key-note address given by John Howard Lawson, Communist screen writer identified in Section I.

The last speaker at this meeting was Paul Draper, a well-known dancer, who discussed the captioned production. Draper stated that while reading the script he noted that it was to depict a play during the life of the Hitler regime and that his script required him to say a line which ridiculed Hitler and had the effect of calling Hitler the most serious menace of the day. Draper stated he realized that the comment concerning Hitler could have been written in Hitler's time and realized that the script should be revised. He related he asked the director, whose name he did not give, as to what line should be substituted for this line concerning Hitler. The director told Draper to substitute the name of Stalin for Hitler. Draper indicated that he realized the significance of such a statement and said he could not say such a line in the movie. He then commented to the audience that he had a great ambition to dance in the Soviet Union and the Balkans at some future date.

"BODY AND SOUL"

Released by Enterprise Productions

Producer -- R. B. Roberts
Director -- Robert Rossen
Screen Play -- Abraham Polonsky
Cast: Starring -- John Garfield
 Lili Palmer
 Anne Revere

The director, Robert Rossen, has been identified as a member of the Communist Party in Los Angeles. His Communist connections are set out in Section I of this memorandum. The screen writer, Abraham Polonsky, has also been identified as a Communist and his Communist connections are set out in Section I.

The cast includes John Garfield, who has been identified by Confidential Informant [REDACTED] as a Communist, and Anne Revere, who also has been identified as a Communist and her Communist connections are set out in Section I of this memorandum.

[REDACTED] who reviewed the picture "Body and Soul," stated that it deals with the prize fight racket and as far as Communist propaganda is concerned, he did not believe it was "as hot as others" he had seen. He related, "It portrays the rich and successful man in a bad light and the finest character of them all is a colored fighter." The colored fighter is managed by a dishonest promoter and is maneuvered into a position where he fights a bout with a clot on his brain and is killed. The manager, according to [REDACTED] "knows it will kill him and in the picture uses the line 'so what, it's business.'"

In bribing various fighters, [redacted] related, the white man takes the bribe and the negro refuses \$60,000 to throw a fight, portraying the negro in a fine light, which, according to [redacted] is the principal form of propaganda in this picture. The negro fighting while injured knowing that he is injured and his manager knowing that it may be his death as well as the negro refusing a bribe while the white man accepts it shows the negro as a noble character and sympathetic character while the successful promoter is shown as an unscrupulous, dishonest, heartless individual.

"ANOTHER PART OF THE FOREST"

Presently in production at Universal-International Studios

The screen play of the above picture was written by Lillian Hellman, whom [REDACTED] has described as a Communist. In addition, the cast stars Frederic March and Florence Eldridge, March's wife. [REDACTED] has also identified March and his wife as Communists.

With regard to Lillian Hellman, Confidential Informant [REDACTED] of the Los Angeles Office in 1944 stated that she was a high-ranking communist who had associated exclusively with known Communists and Communist front organizations for at least twenty years. In this connection, it should be pointed out that Informant [REDACTED] is a former member of the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

According to [redacted] this story deals with "the most degenerate characters I know." He related that the story has to do with a Southern family living in a period immediately following the Civil War. The father has made considerable money by profiteering during the war which has resulted in continuous squabbles over money between him and his family. [redacted] related that the story deals with the reconstruction period and portrays the Southern aristocracy as a degenerate and ignorant class.

reviewed the script for this picture and has made the following remarks:

"This script as a whole, in story, theme, intention, and implication, is most certainly propaganda for Communism - or, more specifically, it is vicious propaganda against the capitalist system.

"The story presents a family of monsters in a small Southern town in the year 1880. All the members of the family are unspeakably depraved (except the mother, who is insane) and indulge in every possible kind of villainy, including incest. They are shown in a manner which implies that they represent a rising new social class - the businessmen.

"The sole motive of the family is greed for money. The father got his start by alleged 'profiteering' during the Civil War and by betraying Confederate soldiers to the Union Army for a financial reward. (He led Union soldiers to a Confederate camp, with the result that 27 young Confederates were slaughtered in their sleep - not a very flattering incident for the Union Army, incidentally.)

"The father, the two sons and the daughter now spend all their time lying, cheating, double-crossing, blackmailing one another and everybody - in order to get money. The pursuit of money is made to appear evil and sickening - and the audience is left with the impression that money can be obtained only by such methods, that these are the only kind of people who can become rich. This is not said explicitly, but it is implied very forcefully - because there is not one line of dialogue, not a single reference to any honest method of acquiring wealth. The Hubbards are not presented as a freak family of scoundrels. They are presented, by implication, as the rich.

"All the other characters of the story, everybody in the town where the action takes place, are poor, ruined by the Civil War. The Hubbards are the only rich in the midst of general devastation. If there are any other kind of rich people in the town, the story never mentions them.

"There is not a single 'good' or actually sympathetic character in the whole story. As sole contrast to the Hubbards, there are only some ruined Southern aristocrats, who are futile, helpless and stupid - such as the stuffy John Bagtry and the half-witted Birdie. These are presented as the only honest people and are placed in the position of 'sympathetic' characters - yet here is what they stand for:

"Pages 101-102:

BIRDIE

'John wants to go to Brazil right now.
The radical people down there are trying to
abolish slavery, Mr. Hubbard, and ruin the

"country. The planters have been looking for Confederate officers so John will be able to fight again for his ideals."

MARCUS

'Why don't you choose the other side? Every man needs to win once in his life.'

JOHN

'I don't like that way of saying it. I fight for a way of life.'

"Here it is clearly driven home that John is not just a character in a story, but the representative of a 'way of life.' The only representative of the other, new 'way of life' which has defeated him, the representative of the capitalistic North as against the feudal South, the accomplice of the Union Army - is Marcus Hubbard (and his vicious children). No, Marcus is not just a villain - he is the symbol of the new economic order. This is stressed explicitly on page 102, where Marcus says to John:

MARCUS

'Well, I disapprove of you. Your people deserved to lose their war and their world. It was a backward world, getting in the way of history. Appalling that you still don't realize it.'

"The political message of the picture is certainly appalling. It tells people in effect, that the course of American history consisted of a slave system which was replaced by something still worse, by the rise of capitalism - as exemplified by Marcus Hubbard. America had nothing to offer - except a choice between the 'ideals' of John Bagtry and the modern world of the Hubbards.

"This is not left merely to implication. It is stressed in a conversation between the two subhuman Hubbard sons, when Ben, the oldest, takes over his father's fortune through blackmail and looks forward to a brilliant financial future for himself.

"Pages 155-156:

BEN

'Big things doing all over the country. Railroads going across, oil, coal.'

"OSCAR

(Eagerly)
'Think we got a chance to be big rich, Ben?'
Ben smiles.

"Here you have the filthy, contemptible implication that the magnificent progress of American industry in the last 19th century, the great spurt of productive energy unequalled in history, the 'railroads, oil and coal' were created by or for the profit of men such as Ben and Oscar!

"If the audience took this picture seriously, they would go out of the theater and murder the first person wearing a mink coat. The only thing to prevent this, will not be the authors' intention, but the lurid preposterousness of the story. The nondiscriminating, however, will leave the theater with a good charge of hatred and indignation against the rich, the businessmen and the American system as a whole.

"On page 119, Marcus Hubbard describes his past as follows:

MARCUS

'At nine years old I was carrying water for two bits a week. I took the first dollar I ever had and went to the paying library to buy a card. At fourteen I was driving mules all day and most of the night. But that was the year I learned my Greek, read my classics, taught myself —'

"This is a fairly subtle point, and the audience might safely miss it, but this passage is a parody on the life story of a self-made man. If Marcus Hubbard were intended to be taken as a plain criminal, he would have been shown spending his youth in reform schools or indulging in petty larcenies. But no, he is given the standard biography of a hard-working, ambitious self-made man. Only Communists would sneer at and discredit the kind of effort Hubbard claims to have made in order to rise and educate himself.

"On page 14, Hubbard's wife explains how he made his money during the Civil War:

LAVINIA

'People were dying for salt, and I thought it would be a kindness to run the blockade and bring it to them....Only I didn't think he would be asking eight dollars a bag for it - a tiny little one pound bag. Making money out of other people's misery!'

"Most people are quite confused on what constitutes war profiteering - so it is a standard Communist practice to denounce legitimate capitalist

"methods in the guise of denouncing 'war profiteering.' By the proper definitions of a free economy, only dishonesty in obtaining or executing government contracts can be classified as 'war profiteering.' The activity denounced in the above dialogue - a man running a blockade and making a profit on a product which he alone is able to supply - is not profiteering, and is not reprehensible. People were not forced to buy his product, they needed it desperately, and there is no definable limit to how much profit a man may or may not make. The mere conception of limiting profit is a collectivist idea. In a free economy, profit is established by supply and demand - and nothing else whatever.

"Such a line as the suggestion that somebody should run a blockade out of 'kindness' is economic demagoguery of the worst kind. Neither 'Kindness,' nor 'noble intentions,' nor altruistic motives can produce goods or pay for them. Somebody has to produce them and somebody has to pay. It is this mixture of 'kindness' with economics that is the sure sign of someone preaching a Communist economy.

"The line 'Making money out of other people's misery!' is practically a bromide of the Communist propaganda machine. If such a slogan is repeated often enough and people actually accept it, it would justify any hungry bum in looting any grocer, because the grocer, too, could be defined as making money out of the bum's misery. The implication here is that it is evil to make money on something which others need. Since nobody buys anything unless he needs it, the further implication is that all profitmaking business is evil.

"Page 111, More of the same disgusting tripe:

LAURETTE

'— you got rich, bringing in salt and making poor, dying people give up everything for it. Right in the middle of the war, men dying for you, and you making their kinfolk give you all their goods and money!'

"Page 110, Marcus-Hubbard says about his son:

MARCUS

'And he steals a little. Nothing much, not enough to be respectable.'

"This may be just a wisecrack - or it may imply that you have to steal a lot in order to become respectable in our society."

[REDACTED] also read the script and stated as follows:

"'The Children's Hour,' 'The Little Foxes' and now this. Three in a row dealing with the most degenerate characters I know. 'The Children's Hour' was a great picture, but made you sick at your stomach. 'The Little Foxes' - you wanted to go out and brush your teeth after you saw it. It was diseased; every character in it was diseased, and yet it was beautifully written. This script is beautifully written, and every character in it is diseased. There is no character here that has any virtue unless it be the mother who was sick-minded, with the exception of three negroes, the three servants in the house. When they appear they are bright and good.

"This picture deals with the South in 1880. It starts with a celebration of a kind of Memorial Day for 20 young Confederates who were murdered, massacred by the Union Army because someone led them to the place where the men were camping and it had never been known who led them. Well, the story develops that it was the rich man of the town today who led the Army to the hiding place. His name is Marcus; he is a money lender and owns the store and lends money at tremendous rates; he is either a Greek or he likes Greeks; he is always reading Aristotle. The mother is a weak, frightened woman, Lavinia, as we first see her, and she is nervous and jumpy and comes down to pray at this field and her husband has forbidden her to go to it. This fine young colored girl gets her in time to bring her back to the house because her husband is a martinet. There is a character of a fine decent Northern money lender who comes down to loan money at 7 per cent and not the 10 and 15 per cent that Marcus has been charging, and the Ku Klux Klan, of which the younger son of Marcus is a member, rides him down and beats him up. The suggestion here was that his father had ordered him to do it because he tried to get money from his father for the act.

"Regina, the younger sister, and daughter of Marcus, has been sleeping with one of the young Confederate men with whom she is in love who does not love her, and the elder brother plots against that situation in order to mix it up because he wants the sister to marry another young rich man. The Southern boy does not have any money. The brother wants his sister to marry a rich man instead of a poor one.

"It is a completely diseased group mentally and morally. The family attitudes and life are beyond belief when you read it, however, every character is believable because it is so finely done; that is to say, it is the same in all three plays. The characters are as believable in this play as they were in 'The Little Foxes' and 'The Children's Hour' because they are so magnificently drawn; because the woman is a magnificent writer."

The author, in portraying the characters, as has been stated above, showed them to be a completely degenerate lot. [redacted] said:

"They are the same people we met in 'The Little Foxes,' decayed gentry. Oscar, the second son of Marcus, is going to marry a little chippy that he calls one of the lower class, a little dance hall girl. The father answers: 'Some people are democrats by choice and some by necessity.' Ben, one of the brothers, tells his sister, in speaking of his father - 'Go up to him Regina, put your arms around him. Lie to him like you always do;' and in talking about his daughter's lover, Marcus epitomizes him as follows: 'A dead man, a foolish man from an idiot world, a man who wants nothing but war, any war, just a war; a man who believes in nothing and never will.'"

This line, according to [redacted] portrayed antiwar propaganda. [redacted] considered it significant that "all the children hate each other; the line occurred 'John wants to go to Brazil right now. The radical people down there are trying to abolish slavery and ruin the country. The planters have been looking for Confederate officers, so John will be able to fight again for his ideals.'" [redacted] stated that this gave him the opinion that this character wanted war anywhere at any time.

The speech on page 102 saying "Your people deserved to lose their war and their world. It was a backward world, getting in the way of history" was, according to [redacted] Communist propaganda. Other Communist propaganda lines, according to [redacted] was a speech on page 111 when a character named Lorette said: "How you got rich, bringing in salt and making poor, dying people give up everything for it; right in the middle of the war, men dying for you and making their kinfolk give you all their goods and money."

[redacted] considered the following line Communistic propaganda when Marcus, speaking of his son, said: "He steals a little. Nothing much, not enough to be respectable."

[redacted] further said, "The only characters there that are decent are the negroes and the insane mother." One incident was portrayed wherein none of the members of the family remembered the mother's birthday but the three negroes appeared in the scene in the midst of a family quarrel, carrying a cake which they had baked, showing that they were the only persons in the house who remembered the mother's birthday.

[redacted] considered significant the following incident in the script when the elder son returned home: He tells the negro to carry his suitcase upstairs, whereupon Marcus says: "Take your valise to your room. It is not seemly for a man to load his goods on other men, black or white."

[REDACTED] saw Communistic propaganda in the following line of the father: "Though ignorance becomes a Southern gentleman, cowardice does not." And in speaking of his sons, Marcus says: "My eldest, a penny-grubbing trickster; my second, a proud illiterate." The scene wherein Colonel Isham, who represents the best people in the town, accepts bribe from Marcus because the Ku Klux Klan rode down and injured a waiter, is propaganda because it portrays the entire community as rotten and penurious. [REDACTED] summarized this picture by saying: "It is as straight a piece of propaganda as you could have for poisoning the mind against successful people."

[REDACTED] With reference to the reviews and comments of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] it should be pointed out that they have vehemently requested that the Bureau keep confidential their identities as well as other individuals who review scripts for the Bureau. It is significant to point out that the scripts were obtained by the Los Angeles Office from reliable contacts at Universal-International and Paramount Studios who would be greatly embarrassed if it became known that the scripts were read by anyone connected with another studio. These scripts are considered as sacred property to the individual studio, and it is very difficult to get them for review.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ (October 2, 1947 to February 5, 1948)

Analysis of Motion Pictures Disclosing Communist Propaganda Therein

One of the pictures which was being "shot" at Universal International Studios during October, 1947, was "All My Sons" written by Arthur Miller and screen collaboration by Chester Erskine. A reliable confidential source who is now deceased, [REDACTED] stated that in his opinion this script contained Communist propaganda. The final script which was obtained by [REDACTED] of Universal Studios, who has requested that his identity be kept most confidential, was then reviewed by [REDACTED] although previously identified in this memorandum he also requested that her identity be maintained confidential. [REDACTED] remarks concerning this production are set out below:

"All My Sons"
(Final Shooting Script, Sept. 31, 1947)
Universal-International Pictures

"This story is the product of a thorough-going Collectivism. It presents two basic tenets of the real Collectivist philosophy: that man has no right to exist for his own sake, and that all industrialists are criminal monsters.

"This is pernicious political propaganda, the more pernicious because it deals with fundamentals and never refers to politics as such nor to any political issue of the moment. There is no mention of Communism by name nor of Soviet Russia. But what the play accomplishes is to tell the audience that capitalism is a horrible evil and that a man's concern for himself or his family is a form of depravity."

"The story is about a small town industrialist who sells defective airplane parts to the army during the war and causes the deaths of twenty-one pilots in plane crashes. He manages to frame his partner for the crime and gets himself exonerated, while his partner goes to jail. He tries to hide his guilt from his son, but when his son discovers it, the father commits suicide."

"The technique employed here is one used very frequently in stories written by Reds: the plot, ostensibly, deals with the evil of making money through fraud; but the whole piece is slanted and twisted into an indictment of money-making as such; under guise of denouncing 'dishonest greed', the story denounces honest profit and all profit.

"Joe Keller, the villainous industrialist, is not presented as a freak, an exception or a plain criminal—but as the typical representative of all industrialists.

"Not a word is said in the entire screenplay about the existence of any other kind of industrialist. There is not a single reference to the magnificent performance of American industrialists during the war, to the miracles of production which they achieved, which supplied the whole world and which won the war. No, the impression left by this play is that all American industrialists were greedy monsters who sold defective munitions for the sake of making profits, that profits cannot be made in any other way, and that American boys lost their lives because of the capitalists' greed. How we won the war and where did our munitions come from, if such was the case, is not explained.

"It is important to note that in all the actual cases of war frauds involving defective munitions (such as the cases that made newspaper headlines recently), the men involved were not professional, established industrialists, but fly-by-nighters and shiftless speculators; they were men with political pull who got government loans and went into war production temporarily, as a racket. If the intention of this play were merely to expose a war profiteer—and not to damn the capitalist system—the wicked industrialist would have been presented as some such racketeer.

"But that is not the way Joe Keller is presented. He is not a shady character—he is a solid, respectable member of the community. He is not a drifter or speculator—he is a self-made industrialist who built his factory and established his business through his own effort, hard work and competence. This point is stressed throughout the play deliberately and repeatedly. There are innumerable references to Joe's technical ability. A great emphasis is laid on the fact that the workers in his factory have coined a slogan of their own—'If you want to know, ask Joe,' because Joe always knows what to do about any technological problem, when everyone else is stuck.

"This sort of characterization is a smear on the best type of American industrialist—the self-made man. To my knowledge, there is no case of this sort of industrialist putting out defective materials, in war, in peace or at any time; the creative industrialist is as proud of the integrity of his product as an artist.

"The propaganda effect achieved by Joe Keller's characterization tells the audience that his crime is not the result of his personal viciousness, but of his position as an industrialist, that it is an unavoidable consequence of the capitalist system.

"This is not left merely to implication, but is made explicit in the climax, where the whole thesis of the play comes through clearly. When his son corners him, Joe Keller confesses his guilt—and gives the following explanation (Page 107):

Joe

"I'm in business—a man is in business—a batch of bad cylinders, and you're out of business. Out of business! You don't know how to operate, they tell you—your stuff is no good. They close you up—tear up your contracts. What's it to them? You lay forty years into a business, and they knock you out in five minutes. What could I do? Let them take forty years? Let them take my life away!"

"THIS is the whole and only explanation for Joe's crime given in the entire play. On the face of it, it is merely plain nonsense, written by some sophomore who knows nothing about business and has never been inside a factory. Why would one batch of bad cylinders put an established manufacturer out of business? How? Who are the 'they' referred to? How would 'they' close him up, and why? How can a business built in forty years be destroyed in five minutes?

"None of this is explained. But it is precisely the loose nonsense that serves the purpose of propaganda: to an uneducated, unthinking audience, this speech conveys the impression that such is the normal course of all American business. It is not the speech of a crook or a criminal talking about a racket. It is the speech of a man talking about business. The only thing that comes across clearly in the speech is a man's concern for his business. That is what the audience is urged to consider as vicious.

"To make sure that nobody misses the point, it is stressed and cinched on Page 108. Joe Keller's son cries to him accusingly: 'Kids hanging in the air by those cylinders, and you knew it! I was so proud you were helping us to win, and you were worrying about your business!'

"If the play's intention were to expose a criminal, and not all business men, such a line as the above could not and would not be written. One does not accuse a criminal of 'worrying about business.'

"On Page 114, Joe Keller, speaking about his son who condemns his crime, says: 'I should've put him out when he was ten, like I was put out. And made him earn his keep. Then he'd know how a buck is made in this world!'

"This is saying quite plainly that all money is made the way Joe Keller made it, and that there is no other way to make it.

"To stress the fact that Joe's morals are typical of the whole business community, it is shown that he is held in high esteem by all the best people in town. Ann, the daughter of his framed partner, thinks that this is a proof of Joe's innocence. Then she is horrified to learn from Sue, one of the town's respectable women, that Sue and all the others believe Joe to be guilty: (Page 60A)

Ann

"But that can't be!—they're on the best terms with everyone in the block. They play cards all the time, and—!

Sue

"So what? They give Joe credit for being clever. I guess I do, too."

"It is never explained how Joe managed to be exonerated by a court. Again, in a kind of sophomore's conception of law, it is merely stated that Joe denied a telephone conversation (in which he told his partner to ship the bad cylinders) and this was all he had to do: he went free and the partner went to jail. Apparently the court needed and made no investigation, called no witnesses. What impression does this leave with the audience about our law, our justice and our courts? Well, the play makes a point of cinching that impression, too. On Page 64, a young lawyer, the son of the framed partner, is asked: 'How's the law?' And answers: 'I don't know. When I was studying it seemed sensible. But outside there doesn't seem to be much of a law.'

"The manner in which Joe Keller passes the defective plane cylinders to the Army is worse than preposterous: he sneaks into his factory on a Sunday, when no one is around, removes the rejection tags which are attached to the bad cylinders, and replaces them with tags marked 'Ship' (pp. 90-91). It's as simple as that. Nothing is said about any government inspections after the cylinders left the factory. A fraud committed through such a procedure is

"blatantly impossible. But what is accomplished here? The audience gets the impression that the sole, personal action of one greedy manufacturer could be and was responsible for the wholesale slaughter of American flyers. What sort of an impression does this give the audience about our entire system, both economic and political, both in regard to our business and to our government?

"The above points cover one major part of the play's theme. The other major part is the constant emphasis, hammered throughout the play, that the real evil in Joe Keller's heart, the motive for his crime, was his love for his own family. It is implied that such a love is vicious, anti-social selfishness. The play's thesis, in effect, is as follows: love of family is individual and, therefore, vicious—as opposed to love of society, which is collective and, therefore, virtuous.

"Pages 114-115. Here is how Joe Keller justifies himself to his wife:

Joe

"'You wanted money, so I made money. A man has to take care of his family. That's the first thing—he has to take care of his family. What must I be forgiven? You needed money, didn't you? To buy clothes and food and send them to school. You had to have money, didn't you?'

Kate

"'Not that way, Joe.'

Joe

"'I didn't want it that way, either. What difference is it as long as you've got it...I could live on a quarter a day myself. But I got a family, so I—'

Kate

"'Joe!—it doesn't excuse it that you did it for the family.'

Joe

"'It's got to excuse it!'

Kate

"'There's something bigger than the family to him.'

Joe

"...I'm his father and he's my son. Nothing is bigger than that. And you're going to tell him, understand? I'm his father and he's my son. And if there's something bigger than that, I'll put a bullet in my head!"

"This scene is a plain, open attack on the family as an institution. It uses the terms of a man's proper, decent concern for the support of his family ('You needed money...to buy clothes and food and send them to school,') and presents this concern as a murderous evil. It stresses that there is 'something bigger than the family.' What? Why, the collective, of course.

"Page 124. Chris, the son, makes his final speech when his mother asks him what she and his father can do now about their guilt. Chris answers: 'You can be better! Once and for all, you can know now that the whole earth comes in through those fences--there's a universe outside, and you're responsible to it.'

"What 'fences'? The only meaning that can be attached to this piece of wooziness is that concern for the family (or for the individual) is a vicious form of building a fence around oneself—and that 'the whole earth' of 'the universe' (that is, the collective) will 'come in through.'

"Page 123. In his last speech, before he walks out to commit suicide, Joe Keller speaks of Larry (his older son who killed himself on learning about his crime) and says: 'I think to him they (the dead flyers) were all my sons. And I guess they were—all my sons.'

"That is the title of the play. The tenet that a man must love everybody's children, all children, just exactly as much as his own (not in the sense of respecting their rights or feeling benevolence, but literally love them as much as his own, making no distinction whatever) is an old one among collectivist writers. It is found quite often in the books and plays written by Reds. This is not a 'Communist Party Line' in the narrow, political sense of the word. It's a little deeper than that: it's the Collectivist 'party line'."

"Page 125. The play ends on a speech by Kate, the mother, when Chris leaves his home forever with the girl he loves.

Kate

"Make a clean world for yourselves, you two—forget us—and what we were. And never look back. Never! Larry is dead—and Joe is dead—so live—live!"

"If the play were merely denouncing one criminal—why should the mother tell Chris to 'make a clean world'? If Joe Keller were intended to be taken as an exception, his crime would not make the world dirty. The implication here is obvious: Joe Keller represents the world of American business—so his son must make a new world, which would be 'clean'. What kind of new world?

"Translated from the double-talk, here is what this speech conveys to the audience: 'Make a collectivist world for yourselves—forget the past—and what America was. And never turn reactionary. Never! Business men are dead—so live—live!'

"This theme and all the implications listed above come across quite clearly in the screenplay. (There are many other passages preaching or hinting at Collectivism, too numerous to mention). That is the effect the movie will have on an audience, and those are the ideas it will convey.

"Now it is extremely interesting to note that in the Story Test Report of Audience Research, Inc. (which accompanied this script), there is a synopsis of the original stage play from which this screenplay was adapted—and the stage play states its theme openly, in undisguised language. On Page 15 of the synopsis, there is the following scene, which has been omitted from the screenplay:

"What should I do?" Joe begs. "Jail? You want me to go to jail?" Chris is silent. Tears brim in his eyes.

"Near tears himself, Joe moves toward him. "What's the matter, why don't you tell me? I'll tell you why you can't say it. Because you know I don't belong there. Because you know! If my money's dirty, there ain't a clean nickel in the United States. Who worked for nothin' in that war? When they work for nothin', I'll work for nothin'. Did they ship a gun or a truck outa Detroit before they got their price? Is that clean? Nothin's clean. It's dollars and cents,

"Nickels and dimes, war and peace, it's nickels and dimes.
The whole goddam country is gotta go if I do! That why
you can't tell me!"

"That's exactly why," Chris says.

"Then am I bad?"

"I didn't call you bad. I know you're no worse than most,
but I thought you were better."

"On Page 12 of the synopsis, Chris's angry speech to his father is given at greater length than it is in the screenplay, and in greater detail. Observe the nature of the detail:

"...I was dying every day and you were killing my boys and you did it for me? I was so proud you were helping us win and you did it for me? What the hell do you think I was thinking of, the goddam business? Is that as far as your mind can see, the business? What is that, the world—the business? What are you made of, dollar bills?..."

"To suggest that a factory can and should produce 'guns and trucks' without payment is an idea that could be preached seriously only by a moron or a scoundrel. How long would such a factory remain in business? What would it use to pay the salaries of its workers and the bills for its raw materials? There is only one economic system under which a factory could produce without profit (in theory and on paper only), the system which is apparently advocated by this play—the system of Communism. In practice, of course, factories under Communism simply do not produce. As witness—the lend-lease from our capitalistic factories to Soviet Russia.

"There is only one economic system under which men 'work for nothin'.' And they literally work for nothing—not getting even enough food. As witness—the slave labor camps of Soviet Russia.

"Note also Chris's line to his father: 'I know you're no worse than most.' This is saying plainly that most business men—and most Americans, for that matter—earn money through fraud, treason and murder.

"This is sickening.

"The fact that the above passages have been omitted from the screenplay does not change the nature of the story nor of its message nor of its propaganda effect. The omission merely makes the propaganda a little less crudely blatant. But all the implications are still there, in the whole plot, action, characterizations and dialogue of the screenplay. The audience will make its own conclusions—and these conclusions will, in substance, be precisely what the omitted passages had said openly. It's all there.

"Here are some quotations from audience reactions, as given in the same Story Test Report:

"A clever, interesting story manifesting the weaknesses of man. Particularly strong in denunciation of American capitalists.'

"...although it probably was fictional, it seems as if it might be about any American family.'

"The story is a fine expose of the many defective weapons that were made during the war and which caused many deaths.'

"The following quotations are answers given to the Story Test Report's question: 'What did you like most about the story itself?—'

"The conflict of today's idealistic veteran (Chris) and the whole world as consisting of the Joe's and Kate's. A story of our times.'

"The illusion to American industry implying it is all corrupt and instrumental in killing many American boys.' (I believe the work intended here was: 'allusion.')

"Perhaps it would show some of these business men to do less finagling around, especially if it's tampering with lives.'

"Now is there any excuse for the producers of this movie to claim that they do not know what sort of thing they are producing?"

The cast of the picture "All My Sons" as furnished by Confidential Informant [REDACTED] is as follows:

Edward G. Robinson
Burt Lancaster
Mady Christians
Louisa Horton
Lloyd Gough

Arlene Francis
Henry Morgan
Elizabeth Fraser
Howard Duff
Frank Conroy

Writer-Producer - Chester Erskine

Director - Irving Reis

Of the above, Lloyd Cough has been reported to be a member of the Communist Party in Hollywood by [REDACTED] a former paid confidential informant who was a functionary of one of the clubs in Los Angeles. It should be noted that there is no information available in the Los Angeles Field Office indicating that Arthur Miller, the playwright, is or has been a member of the Communist Party. However, the script was included because, according to [REDACTED] it "is the product of a thorough-going Collectivism."

The script entitled "In Place of Splendor" by Constancia de la Mora was also reviewed by [REDACTED]. This script was furnished by [REDACTED] screen writer [REDACTED] stated that this script had been sent to a prominent screen actress by Ring Lardner, Jr. The letter transmitting the script to the actress is set out below:

"Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation
Studios
Beverly Hills, California

"December 11, 1946

"We once talked at Irving Reis's house about the writers' motion picture company of which I am one of the founders, and you expressed an especial interest in the script of Constancia de la Mora's In Place of Splendor, which we were preparing. I'm sending it to you now so that in case you think it's a possible vehicle for you, we can arrange a meeting to discuss it.

"In Place of Splendor is planned as the first production of Xanadu Films, whose members, besides myself, are Dalton Trumbo, Allan Scott, Richard Collins, Hugo Butler, and, for variety, a producer (R. E. Roberts) and an actor (John Garfield). As you know, Miss de la Mora's book was a factual auto-biography but because several of the characters involved are still living, we decided with her to make the screenplay a fictional work based on the book.

"Though it is a cardinal precept of our company not to proceed with production plans until we are sure the script is right, we have relaxed the rule somewhat in this instance because Miss de la Mora, who is much more interested in having the picture made than in money, is extremely anxious that preliminary arrangements at least get under way as soon as possible. However, though we don't feel this script is quite the final draft, it is certainly close enough to it for you to form an opinion of the whole project.

"I'd appreciate it if you would call or write me about the script at 20th Century-Fox or at the address below.

"Sincerely,

/s/ Ring Lardner, Jr.

Ring Lardner, Jr.
9481 Readcrest Dr.
Beverly Hills. CR. 1-9377

"RL:FM
encl"

It was noted in the above letter that of the individuals making up the firm, according to Lardner, the following are members of the Communist Party who have been identified as such through a most highly confidential and delicate source: Dalton Trumbo, Richard Collins, Hugo Butler, and Ring Lardner, Jr.

According to [REDACTED] when the actress to whom this script was sent had read a portion of it, she threw it on the floor in disgust, calling it outright Communist propaganda, and refused to have any further contact with Lardner concerning this production.

The script was read by Mervyn LeRoy, a producer at MGM, who said that in his opinion the script was "obvious propaganda and would make a lousy picture."

The address of the Xanadu Films is given on the frontispiece of the script as 1052 Carol Drive, Los Angeles. This is the address of the R. B. Roberts Agency, whose secretary-manager is Kathryn Etta Jane O'Neill, alias Kathryn Etta Jane Roberts, alias Katie Roberts, who was a member of the Communist Party in 1943, according to a most highly confidential and delicate source.

The remarks of informant [REDACTED] concerning the script of "In Place of Splendor" are set out below:

"IN PLACE OF SPLENDOR"

Screenplay

by

Richard Collins

From the Book by Constancia de la Mora

"This screenplay is crude propaganda, and quite sickening. It has no plot, story or drama. Its characters serve only as puppets who move through and talk about political events. The theme is ostensibly the Spanish Revolution. But since very little is said or shown about the concrete event or conditions pertaining specifically to the political history of Spain, the impression one receives is the theme is revolution as such, revolution entering class war.

"The only idea that emerges constantly from the very messy action is the idea that the lower classes must seize the power from the upper classes, that the poor are noble victims and the rich vicious monsters. The revolution is treated, not as an issue of political freedom for everybody, but as an issue of the poor against the rich. This, of course, is a Marxist standard.

"All the characters who come from the upper classes are vicious, with the exception of the heroine and a few of those sympathetic to her. But these few are all 'for the Republic' or, 'for the people,' even though they are born in aristocracy. Everyone who is not 'for the Republic' is presented as a monster. All the poor—servants, peasants, or workers are presented as golden-hearted creatures full of nothing but kindness and maternal love. This is all as crude as that.

"The story opens with a sequence which casts an ugly reflection on the Catholic Church. It shows the children of the rich in the Convent School, being drilled and ordered about like soldiers. The first words of the screenplay come from Maria, (the heroine as a child) reading to the class the story of a Catholic saint as follows:

Maria's voice

(distinctly)

"...There can be little room for doubt that Margaret shortened her life by her austerities. At the end of every Lent she was in a pitiable state from fasting, deprivation of sleep, and neglect of her person.

"The rest of what she reads is on the same order. It is a description of religion definitely slanted in such a way that it makes it sound revoltingly cruel and senseless about a saint who died of privation.

"The cruelty and hypocrisy of the rich is emphasized in the next scene when the rich little girls are marched in a straight line to a row of poor little girls and each rich girl hands a bun with a piece of chocolate to each poor girl, undoubtedly in dead silence. This is apparently a caricature on the futile charity of the rich. The 'social significance' is stressed as follows:

"CLOSE SHOT - MARIA AND HER POOR GIRL

"Maria puts out her hand with the bun and piece of chocolate in it. The little girl automatically raises hers, but her eyes are fixed on Maria's coat—it's warm—and then, almost unconsciously, without taking her eyes away, the little girl reaches out and touches Maria's black coat very gently for a second, just long enough so that her hand, blue with cold, can sense the warmth and softness of the wool. On her face is the most complete and wonderful absorption. And Maria, watching her, is suddenly and inexplicably ashamed—...

"In the next scene, Maria, a small child, talks to her grandfather and is given the following incredible dialogue:

Don Antonio

"We have had a great and proud history."

Maria

"Will we always be great?"

Don Antonio

"Only if we deserve it."

Maria

"Paco says "only if we can solve our social problems."!"

"Maria grows up and marries Perrin, a rich young man of noble family, then discovers that he is arrogant, superficial and cruelly indifferent to her

"feelings. Her life with him in his ancestral mansion is shown as stiff and unhappy. 'His mother is a large woman with a strikingly arrogant face, but it is a face from which all dignity has gone.' (Page 38) The maid of the family is a 'young peasant girl wearing an ugly maid's uniform...' Perrin and his brothers are ardent monarchists. An old uncle, who is a Republican, says of the family, 'Except for Maria, there is not a decent person among you.'

"In the next scene, Perrin is shown firing the maid and her husband, because the husband voted in an election and Perrin had forbidden the husband or peasants to vote (how he could forbid it is not explained). Then Perrin is shown punishing his and Maria's little daughter with pointless cruelty.

"In the next scene 'social significance' comes up with a bang when we see two members of the Civil Guard dragging 'a ragged, half-starved, rain-soaked peasant boy' into Perrin's house. They demand that the boy tell them who stole an automobile tire. The boy begs for mercy, protests he doesn't know. With the approval of Perrin and his brothers, the guards proceed to beat and torture the boy. Perrin's brother explains: 'The peasants must learn that if a tire is stolen, someone will be punished.'

"Suddenly a crowd of peasants breaks into the house. The Republic has won the election, therefore, the peasants now have a right to break into a private house. It is here implanted that the Republic is not a political victory, but a class victory--the triumph of the lower classes. One of Perrin's brothers yells: 'Get out or we'll call the police!' The peasant answers: 'They are our police now—not yours.' This is politics, not in terms of ideas (which would be the American conception of politics), but in terms of class warfare (which is Marxism).

"Maria leaves her husband, unable to stand him any longer and goes back to the city, taking their little daughter Elvira. At the railway station in Madrid she sees the hero of the story, Jose d' Alberti, and hears him make a speech about the new Republic. Jose is an officer of the Air Force and a nobleman, but he has been in exile for revolutionary activities against the monarchy and he has now returned as a national hero.

Jose

"It (Spain) must become dear and sweet to all of us. It must become precious to our peasants in our land—to the people in our villages, and to the workers in our cities. All must work for it.

"Note here that the only two official classes named specifically are: 'Peasants and workers.' The 'Republic of Workers and Peasants' was an (and still is) official slogan of Soviet Russia.

"In the next scene a taxi driver talks to Rosita, Maria's maid. He explains to her: 'Perhaps it is all right for your mistress to be sad. But you! You should be all smiles!...You do not seem to understand that you and I are now running the country.' On Page 68, the taxi driver says further: 'I have a cousin who is a servant for such a great lady as your own--she is treated like a dog.' On Page 70 they see a new flag of the Republic being raised. The taxi driver exclaims: 'There it goes--over the Bank of Spain! Over the War Ministry! This is for you, my little bird, as well as for me...' Why should it be stressed that a Republican flag is raised over a bank? A free and proper republic is based on property rights--therefore a change from a monarchy to a republic would not effect property or banks. What seems to be implied here is an economic issue--a republic that would affect banks, is some unstated way, for the benefit of taxi drivers and servants. There is only one kind of economic system that takes over property--Communism (or Socialism, which is the same thing).

"On Page 74, a group of railway workers stand watching the departure of the King of Spain. 'They do not regret the king's departure. They are rather pleased by the sense of their new legally arrived-at power.' It would be interesting to know how one conveys 'legally arrived-at power' by a facial expression.

"Maria and Jose d' Alberti fall in love. There is no divorce in old Spain. But the Republic passes a law permitting divorce. Jose brings Maria to listen to the Cortes (parliament) discussion of the new law (Pages 96-98). Even though this sequence is worded merely as a defense of a person's right to divorce, the general impression it leaves is that of an attack on the institution of marriage. There was no plot or story reason for including this scene in the Cortes. For story purposes, we merely had to know that a new law had been passed, and that the heroine was permitted to divorce her husband. Why was it necessary to show a scene with long speeches advocating divorce? The impression that this was intended as an indirect attack on marriage is heightened by the fact that the Rightist Deputy, who is here presented in the position of a villain standing in the way of the heroine's happiness, has the following lines in his speech: 'The Spanish home is the foundation of our Spanish life. It is the bulwark of our nation.' (Page 98). One may gather

"that those who speak of the home as the bulwark of a nation are made to appear most unsympathetic.

"The scene on Pages 99-103 in which Maria's husband, Perrin, comes to confer with her with two lawyers and announces he has the power to deprive her of all rights—leaves the ugliest kind of impression about marriage as a legal institution. Of course, it deals specifically with the marriage laws of Spain. But the impression it leaves may and can apply to all marriage in general, marriage as such.

"Next, there is a sequence showing Maria and Jose attending a performance of a play given for the peasants in the village. This sequence deals specifically with the fact that the theater is brought 'to the peasants' for the first time and suggests the impression of a class approach to art, art brought to the masses. The author of the play which is being presented to the peasants says: 'The Republic has brought them our imagination and our poetry, and has given us our real audience.' (Page 108). Why? Why is art a matter of politics?

"On Page 113 there is an extremely silly line that carries some pretty awful implications. Maria comes to tell her father, who disapproves, that she is going to take advantage of the new divorce law and is then going to marry Jose. She says: '...I am going to be happy with him. I have this chance...it has been given me legally by my government.' It is only from a collectivist or statist perspective that anybody could permit himself to speak, either carelessly or accidentally, about receiving one's chance of happiness as a gift from the government.

"The rest of the story, after Maria's divorce, is taken up with politics almost entirely. It now presents in newsreel fashion the rise of Franco and the Spanish Civil War. All the rebels are presented as Fascists and monsters. All the Loyalists as pure angels fighting for freedom and for the people.

"Maria and Jose are fighting on the Loyalist side in besieged Madrid. In this part of the story the political trend is quite clear. The Loyalists are shown fighting desperately, alone, abandoned by the whole world. On Page 132 there is the following dialogue:

Maria

"But why can't we stop them? Almost all of Spain is on our side."

Jose

"We have the Spaniards. But they have the steel...We cannot buy arms from France, England, or the United States even though we are the duly elected government."

"On Page 134 Maria and Jose are on their way to their wedding and are caught in the bombardment of the city by Fascist planes. Buildings collapse around them, and all seems lost when Jose cries:

Jose

"If you will turn and look, you will see a miracle."

"The miracle is a squadron of new planes 'flying with impossible speed' that descends on the Fascist planes, beats them, and saves the day. Jose explains to Maria: 'Four days ago these planes which Russia sold us arrived in Cartagena...'

"This speaks for itself!"

"As things get worse in besieged Madrid, Jose and Maria are worried about their little daughter, Elvira, and the following scene takes place between them:

Jose

"I've been thinking. We're really not able to take care of Elvira."

Maria

"You think we should send her with the other children to Russia?"

Jose

"I think it would be better for her—school, and food, and no bombings. And it would be better for us—we'd know she was safe."

"The next scene shows Maria and Jose taking Elvira aboard the Russian ship. The dialogue is:

Elvira
(in a sudden moment of panic)

"I don't want to go! I'll be eating all kinds of good things and living in warm rooms--and you'll still be eating lentils--"

Jose
(to Elvira--reassuring her)

"You will like it! It is a big country and very interesting--only remember that you are their guest."

"The cabin of the Russian ship is described as follows: 'It has two bunks in it and it is gaily decorated. A Russian stewardess shows Elvira and Maria in. There are some little hand made toys on the bunk. Elvira goes up to the desk and looks at two pictures of two smiling little girls. The pictures are decorated with flowers.'

"The dialogue is as follows:

Stewardess

"They are my children...and I put their pictures in this cabin so that Elvira and the other little Spanish girl will not be lonely for their playmates.

"The stewardess goes out. Maria sits down with Elvira.

Maria

"It's exciting. You are going to find it a gay adventure!"

Elvira

"I'll have a good time. You need not worry about me...I will not even cry."

"The Civil War continues and Jose is badly hurt in a plane crash. The doctor advises Maria that Jose needs rest and safety.

Doctor

"...Let him have good food—music, perhaps. Get him out of Barcelona. Get him to sleep."

Maria

"But where can we go?"

Doctor

"France... Maybe Russia. They have taken many Spanish children.— Perhaps the Crimea would be very good for him."

"However, Jose does not go the the Crimea. Maria smuggles him across the border into France, but he recovers and flies back to fight with the losing Loyalist forces in Spain. Maria is interned by the French authorities in a horrible kind of concentration camp. It is not explained why the refugees from Spain are put into this camp and kept in such miserable conditions. It is merely shown that this is the way the French treat them. One wonders whether the contrast with the smiling stewardess on the Soviet Russian ship is intentional or accidental.

"The last scene shows this concentration camp with 'miles of beach without shelter, surrounded down to the sea by barbed-wire, and protected at various points by machine guns aimed at the beach...A group of people, ragged, torn, weary, are entering the camp. Among them is Maria.' She is described as follows: 'She is desperately weary. Her clothes are poor, she has no belongings, she is dirty and hungry.' But Maria still holds hope for the future of her political fight in Spain. As an appeal to the whole world, and, one must assume, specifically to America, she gives the following message to an American newspaperman who asks her for a statement:

Maria

(quietly)

"Tell them—they will have to pay and dearly for the loss of our freedom. Tell them that all that one people can do we have done. Now it is up to them."

"The last shot of the picture is a symbolic expression of true collectivism,

"She (Maria) starts to move off, CAMERA PANS WITH HER, she moves to rejoin her countrymen and women--she merges with--becomes one of them--as we

FILM OUT."

"The individual merging in the mass?

"The political thesis of this screenplay is too clear to need further comment."

"SO WELL REMEMBERED"

The picture "So Well Remembered" was produced by RKO and Arthur Rank, was directed by Edward Dmytryk, and produced by Adrian Scott. The musical score was written by Hanns Eisler and the screen play by John Paxton. Hedda Hopper in her column in the Los Angeles Times appearing October 30, 1947, stated: "If there were a command performance in Moscow I don't believe the boys would find a picture made under the banner of democratic freedom more to their liking than 'So Well Remembered'. While there is not a single mention of Communism in the film, not one suggestion of the hammer and sickle, capitalism is represented as decaying, corrupt, perverted, unfeeling, first by a father who served twenty years in prison for gambling with his employees' money..."

"Politics under the system of free election are represented as crooked. When one of the bigwigs whitewashes the slum situation to get the young social reformer to run for Parliament, fortunately the candidate discovers the capitalistic plot in time to withdraw from the race and stick to his fight for reform. He, who is described as a 'radical' in the picture, is the one Simon Pure, completely sympathetic character depicted.

"There are two schools of thought on such a picture as 'So Well Remembered'. The Lefties argue that by inspiring social reform through such mediums we may prevent Communists from taking over. Others claim that such pictures are paving the way for the Reds to take over our country...I urge you to see it, then decide for yourself whether or not Hollywood is capable of inserting Leftie propaganda in its films."

It should be noted that both Scott and Dmytryk have been identified as Communists. In connection with the above, it is of interest to point out that on December 19, 1946, Leon Goldberg, executive in charge of RKO Studios, contacted the Los Angeles FBI Office, at which time he desired to know whether Hanns Eisler was a member of the Communist Party or was in any way involved with his brother, Gerhardt Eisler. Goldberg gave as the reason for endeavoring to secure this information that the RKO Studios had approximately one and one-half million dollars

tied up in a picture which had been recently shot in England by the Arthur Rank Alliance Productions. This picture was to be released under the title "So Well Remembered," and was being completed in this country. It was contemplated that Hanns Eisler would be employed to write the musical score for this picture.

Certain individuals under contract to RKO, according to Goldberg, were putting pressure on him to hire Eisler to write the musical score. These persons were identified as Adrian Scott and Edward Dmytryk. Goldberg, during his conversation stated that he did not care what a man's political beliefs were as long as they did not affect the company's business operations from a financial standpoint. Goldberg did not evidence any apprehension over the security of this country, but dwelt primarily on the protection of the company's financial investment.

On November 7, 1947, [REDACTED] Federation of Women's Clubs, who conducts motion picture reviews and reports under the name of the Southern California Motion Picture Council, Inc., furnished the following information:

[REDACTED] advised that a review as published of this picture in "Unbiased Opinions of Current Motion Pictures," a weekly periodical published by the Fox West Coast Theaters in Los Angeles, did not entirely agree with her personal beliefs. [REDACTED] said she was outvoted, and that her opinion of the picture was that it contained subtle Communist propaganda. She said the proof would be difficult, but it was a definite attempt to portray the idea that socialistic action was the only solution to the poverty and housing questions. The picture was a direct slap at the U. S. A.'s way of doing things. It should be noted that the Southern California Motion Picture Council review heretofore mentioned was not derogatory, and no mention was made in it of Communistic or Socialistic propaganda.

"HAZARD"

Confidential Information [REDACTED] of the Los Angeles Office stated that Paramount Studios are currently readying for production a picture based on the book, "Hazard," written by Raymond Chanselor. The story deals with a girl of wealth and background who becomes infected with the gambling fever and runs through her inheritance in short order, eventually winding up in a cheap hotel in California, having fled from the attentions of a mobster in some Eastern city who wants her to return to him. The girl's part is played by

Paulette Goddard who, when she arrives at the cheap hotel mentioned above and is shown to her room, asks the negro porter where she can place a bet on the horses. The porter replies that he does not know; that he is a Sunday school teacher and is not interested in such matters as this.

According to [redacted] up to this point no character appearing in the picture has any good qualities, all are hoodlums, gamblers, and underworld persons.

It develops that the hotel in which Goddard is staying has a "crap" table in the basement which is operated for small stakes, and she is down there shooting crap when the place is raided. At this point in the plot it happens that the negro porter, recognizing latent good qualities in the heroine, is in the room attempting to dissuade her from gambling. Since he is in the room the porter is arrested with the others and taken before the judge. When they appear in court all of them are low underworld characters except the negro. Goddard makes a plea for his release, saying he had no part whatever in the gambling. The negro appears as a fine, upstanding individual in comparison to everyone else in the cast.

[redacted] questioned why the negro would be working in such a hotel and pointed out to studio executives that in the South this sequence would be cut out of the picture entirely, since negroes are not portrayed on the screen. [redacted] stated that the studio was having difficulty with Goddard because she is firmly refusing to go ahead with the picture since [redacted] had the negro removed and a white porter substituted in his place.

Confidential Informant [redacted] Paramount Studios, volunteered information that the studio's defense in its trouble with Goddard is that, in accordance with the rules of the Screen Actors Guild, the studios have agreed not to portray negroes as redcaps, bootblacks, porters and other alleged menial types. Goddard has taken the stand that she wants to see the negro character portrayed exactly as he was in the original script. [redacted] is of the personal opinion that this entire matter represents what he considers to be Communist propaganda in motion pictures.

As an example of how negro scenes are placed in pictures so that they can be cut out by Southern exhibitors, he referred to the Paramount production "Variety Girl" currently being shown. A negro does a song and dance act and it is so placed in the picture that the entire sequence can be cut out without affecting the continuity of the production. This is done deliberately so that Southern exhibitors can remove the part.

"CROSSFIRE"

"Crossfire" has been previously discussed in this memorandum on Page 14 of Section IV. This picture was seen and reviewed by reliable paid confidential informant of the Los Angeles Office [REDACTED] who has submitted the following report concerning the picture:

"A motion picture produced by RKO Studios in Hollywood. This picture was produced by Adrian Scott, exposed as a member of the Communist Party by the House Committee on Un-American Activities now in session in Washington, D. C.

"The director of the picture is Edward Dmytryk, a member of the Communist Party exposed by the same Committee now in session.

"The picture has very little entertainment value and is one of propaganda solely. The theme is the subject of anti-Semitism, designed to increase better feeling between Gentiles and Jews, basically an admirable gesture.

"However, it is highly debatable whether the picture serves the purpose, or whether it stimulates the opposite effect, namely, increases the tension in a very subtle manner. There is a great division of opinion in this respect among the Jewish people themselves. Some uphold the picture, particularly those who follow along with or sympathize with the aims of the Communist Party or the Soviet Union, and some think the picture should not have been made. The latter constitute the more conservative section of the Jewish people.

"The scene is laid among the most sordid surroundings, and involves a group of soldiers in the army of the United States. The principal characters are:

"An army captain, a large powerful man, who is pictured as a rabid Jewhater and, practically, a psychopathic case.

"A young Jew invalided out of the army.

"A captain of police who solves the crime of murder on which the picture is based.

"A young woman, in effect a prostitute, who works as a dancing girl in a night club of ill repute.

"The rest of the characters are inconsequential.

"The scene opens at a bar where a group of soldiers, including the young Jew, are drinking. The captain is the positive character who dominates the scene and who seems to have complete influence over all present. The young Jew says nothing, just sits and drinks.

"During the action here, the captain constantly makes remarks about the 'Jew Boy,' ridiculing him and otherwise calling attention to his racial characteristics, but patronizing him at the same time.

"The scene then shifts to the apartment of the young Jew, who has an appointment with one of the girls of the joint. Four of the soldiers, including the captain also go to the apartment where the party is turned into a drinking orgy. During this party the captain kills the Jewish boy, but not before the other soldiers, except one, have left.

"From here on to the finish, when the crime is proved on the captain, there is the usual melodramatic detective work by the Captain of Police and assistants who eventually solve the crime. During this action there are the usual sequences on the sordid level, of one of the soldiers going to the apartment of the bar girl and coming into contact with her pimp; the killing by the captain of the one soldier who was present when he committed the murder to keep him from telling; the portrayal of the soldiers as drunks and misfits, or morons.

"In all the picture, there is only one character, the wife of one of the soldiers, the one who gets trapped into the apartment of the young prostitute, who seems to possess a measure of admirable qualities. Her part is very limited.

"As this picture is most simple in plot, a psychopathic anti-Semite whose whole nature is distorted by hatred of the Jews and who kills one in a drunken orgy, the dialogue and lines of the picture determine its nature. In this respect, this reviewer draws the following inferences:

"1. The portrayal of the average American soldier drawn from civilian ranks as a drunkard or a semi-moron, a dissolute individual sexually and as one who is naturally attracted to the lower levels of social life. Only of the soldier characters, the young man from Tennessee, who showed any tendency at all of possessing ethical or moral qualities, was entrapped by the prostitute. He was described by the Captain, the villain of the picture, as being a moron that had never worn a pair of shoes before he entered the army. This is in

line with Hollywood's conception of anyone who comes from the Southern States.

"2. Deprecation of the armed forces of the United States. In this, the lines are put in the mouth of the captain who evinces hatred of the soldier drawn from civilian ranks, he being a professional soldier.

"3. Anti-Semitism: As the picture is based on this theme, it is here that this reviewer concludes that the picture will contribute, very subtly, to an intensification of Anti-Semitism. In those scenes wherein the Captain evinces his hatred of the Jews he reiterates all the cliches and criticisms of Jews such as are heard over and over again, such as 'they live off the fat of the land,' that they are 'parasites,' that during the war they always succeeded in getting 'non-fighting' positions behind the lines, that they 'held all office jobs,' etc. etc. It is the opinion of this reviewer that the recitation of such slogans or cliches really contributes to Anti-Semitism by implanting in the minds of people ideas on the subject that they might never have held before and when they do come across a situation in which a Jew might commit some breach of ethics they would damn the entire race therefor. In other words, it would contribute to the feeling expressed frequently by people who say: 'After all, Hitler did one good job when he went after the Jews'. This, in the opinion of this reviewer, is wherein this picture might contribute seriously to Anti-Semitism and intensification of racial antagonisms in the United States. If this should be the result in any degree, it plays right into the hands of the Communist movement which thrives in large part on racial antagonisms.

"4. This reviewer interviewed seven persons who had seen the picture. All seven labelled it as pure propaganda. Five said it was a flop as a picture from the standpoint of entertainment. Two actually sympathized with the captain's views on the Jews. The five who did not care for the picture because of lack of entertainment value, when questioned as to the propriety of the picture, stated they thought such a picture should not be made because of the 'touchy' nature of the subject. The two who sympathized with the captain's views said they thought the Communists were behind it."

Adrian Scott, in an article appearing in the "Hollywood Reporter" on October 10, 1947, urged the motion picture industry to issue a series of films blasting national prejudices. Scott commented: "One 'Crossfire' is not enough to smother anti-Semitism." He proposed a continuous rolling barrage of specialized shorts, each riddling a national prejudice, which would be furnished free to exhibitors, clubs, churches, etc. He would like to see twenty to start; with most services donated he thinks they can be made for \$10,000 each.

Scott further commented: "One week every year is not enough to devote to the discussion of prejudices. It is a full-time job. The motion picture program is a start and a big start. Only one aspect of anti-minority practice would be dealt with in a film, and the shorts would be designed for the consumption of all age groups. For the very young, obviously a cartoon. For college groups a more mature analysis".

Eddie Cantor, radio and screen personality, placed the following advertisement in the Hollywood trade papers on October 9, 1947:

"EDDIE CANTOR

October 9, 1947

"Mr. Dore Schary,
RKO Radio Pictures, Inc.,
750 Gower Street,
Los Angeles 38, Calif.

"Dear Dore:

"So 'Crossfire' opens in the local theatres today. I saw it four times at the Rivoli Theatre in New York. The first time I had to go—(RKO, y'know)—the last three times I wanted to. What a picture! Adrian Scott did himself proud. Great screen play by John Paxton. Eddie Dmytryk's job of direction is something all producers dream about. You'll not find better performances by any three men this season than those of Robert Young, Robert Mitchum and Robert Ryan.

"As for yourself, here's a great big kiss for having the guts to go through with 'Crossfire.' It has the rare combination of great entertainment and a message which should be heard and seen by every man, woman and child in America. Judging from the boxoffice returns, it looks like that's exactly what will happen.

"'Crossfire' is sure-fire.

"Congratulations!

"Cordially,

"EDDIE"

Concerning Cantor and his present viewpoint, the following is significant:

Through [redacted] it was ascertained that Lawson held a conversation with George Willner on November 10, 1947. On this occasion Willner advised that he had been in contact with various persons in the motion picture industry regarding their reaction to the film hearings. Willner advised Lawson that: "they all say that Jack Lawson is going to work here anytime he wants to". George further stated that he had spoken to Eddie Cantor, at which time Cantor stated he was "going to hire whomever he wished to but, of course, when he talks to other people..."

"GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT"

This picture is currently being shown and it is a production of 20th Century-Fox Studios. A reliable confidential source at MGM, [redacted] furnished the screen credits which are as follows:

Screenplay by	Koss Hart, based on the book by Laura Z. Hobson.
Director	Elia Kazan
Producer	Darryl Zanuck
Music	Alfred Newman
Camera	Arthur Miller
Editor	Harmon Jones
Starring	Gregory Peck, Dorothy McGuire, and John Garfield
Featuring	Anne Revere, Albert Dekker and June Havoc

Of the above, Roberta Garfield, wife of John Garfield, and Anne Revere are both members of the Communist Party, who have been identified as such by a highly confidential and most delicate source.

Screen writer [redacted] has pointed out that in this picture a Police Lieutenant in uniform is a party to anti-Semitism and as such is subjected to much criticism. He went on that in his opinion this was a deliberate slap at law enforcement on the part of someone responsible for the production of the picture.

"MONSIEUR VERDOUX"

This picture was produced by Charles Chaplin and released through the United Artists Studios. Chaplin was also the writer, director and leading character. Among the supporting cast the most well known are Martha Raye and William Frawley.

On October 28, 1947, it was learned through [redacted] that Miriam Brooks Sherman (full-time paid Communist Party functionary; Chairman of the CD Section of the Los Angeles County Communist Party) discussed "Monsieur Verdoux" with Evelyn Averbuck (identified by reliable paid Confidential Informant [redacted] of the Los Angeles Office as a member of the Communist Party,) wife of Alvin Abram Averbuck, full-time paid Communist Party functionary in Los Angeles. During the conversation Sherman raved about the new Chaplin picture, saying, "The guy is a genius. The message at the end was marvelous. It is a real indictment of our system. The anti-religious theme was wonderful, although some people booed at the end of the picture because of it." Sherman was very enthusiastic about this picture and said, "This and 'Crossfire' really prove the worth of Hollywood. If no other pictures were turned out during the year I would still be satisfied. Both were so good I must see them again."

[redacted] reviewed this picture said that in his opinion it was "anti-capitalistic propaganda. It contains a clear implication that nations make war for property; it carries the message that wars such as England and France have engaged in are imperialistic. 'Monsier Verdoux' does as an individual what nations do in waging war." A review of the picture as published in the Fox West Coast Theaters publication "Unbiased Opinions," and made by the Southern California Motion Picture Council says in part:

"Dangerous and destructive are the theories advanced that society owes one comfort, security, even luxury, and that crime committed for love of family or because of need makes the perpetrator an object of sympathy and forgivable. Exonerating the individual and blaming society for all evils, is a very wrong kind of philosophy.

"The picture tells the story of a bank clerk who, having lost his position during depression, decides that big business is organized thievery, and that henceforth he will live by his wits. Having a crippled wife and son to support, he gets his money by attracting and marrying women of wealth, murdering

"them when necessary. After a number of such murder episodes the law catches up with him and, according to French law, he is guillotined, but to the bitter end he remains smirking, cynical, and without remorse, ridiculing the proffered services of the priest."

"IRON CURTAIN"

The anti-Communist picture "Iron Curtain" received a "blast" in the newspaper "PM" on January 20, 1948, captioned, "'Iron Curtain' Movie Called Slander of Russian People." The National Council of Soviet-American Friendship asked 20th Century-Fox Films to withdraw "The Iron Curtain" from distribution because the picture is "inimical to the aims and welfare of the United States and the United Nations." Terming the film "anti-Soviet" and a "flagrant violation of the United Nations' resolution against war propaganda, the Rev. William Howard Kelish, national chairman of the organization, said in a letter to 20th Century-Fox:

"This film will do irreparable harm to the peace for which so many of our young people so valiantly gave their years and lives. The picture comes at a time when the nations of the world are walking the tightrope toward the peaceful future we so fervently desire over the chasm of a third world war. 'The Iron Curtain' might easily upset this balance."

Dana Andrews, according to an article by Sheila Graham in the "Washington Post" on January 30, 1948, stated that the protests of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship against the picture "Iron Curtain" will not affect the release of the picture because the picture is based on fact.

COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN MOTION PICTURES
(February 6, 1948, to Sept. 15, 1948)

All My Sons

and a source of information for the Los Angeles Office, early in 1948 made reference to the fact that the Universal-International Motion Picture Company was doubtful as to whether the Studio would make money from the picture "All My Sons," which the informant characterized as "grim," stating that it was not entertaining as such, but dealt with social problems. In discussing this picture the informant stated the "The message is toned down; the industrialist is made to appear as just one person."

This picture was reviewed in the "Daily Worker" of March 29, 1948, which article reflected that it was adapted from a play by Arthur Miller. This review described the picture as a "Significant Film," and stated "The reader is probably most curious about the content of 'All My Sons': as Hollywood, pressured by fear and red-baiting, watered down the play's significance." The review then stated that already a few of the lines from the original play had been deleted, but that these lines were important to the play's meaning inasmuch as they "broadened the purpose of the play." The article then stated "The play exposed and attacked the general morality of profit making through the particular development and conflict inherent in its character. The movie tends to be narrow. It attacks the particular morality of a particular businessman. If an audience is to see the relationship of this particular expression to the general nature of this system that creates it, they must bring to the film an understanding of the general nature of social relationships that the film itself lacks."

A review of the film, "All My Sons," also appeared in the March 18, 1948, issue of "The People's World." This review stated that even though the father in the play had committed a crime against his fellowman, "guided by the standard of the profit system, he does not see the monstrosity of his act, and can find readily at hand all the rationalizations used to justify every baseness, every criminality, in our modern world up to and including the projected atomic war." The article also stated "...The result is a truly great film, a heartening and refreshing film in these days when the ministers of hysteria seek to suppress every elementary expression of social truth as subversive."

In connection with Arthur Miller, the author of this play, a highly confidential and reliable source of the New York Field Division, reported that as of December, 1943, Arthur Miller was a member of the Stuyvesant Branch of

the Communist Party in New York City, and had been issued 1943 membership number 23345. Information was further received that Miller has been a contributor to the magazine "New Masses."

Another Part of the Forest

[redacted] previously identified, advised that Universal-International Film Corporation had had no major star under contract to the company and in an effort to attract top talent had purchased from Lillian Hellman her play "Another Part of the Forest." This purchase was made because Hellman is a big "Broadway name" and the studio hoped to attract a major star to act in the picture. The efforts were successful, and Frederic March accepted the lead in the picture and the Studios paid Hellman \$200,000.00 for her story. The informant was of the opinion the Studio would not make any money on this picture, characterizing it as "grim" and dealing with a social problem. This production was reviewed in the "Daily Worker" of May 20, 1948, which stated that the play had been adapted to the screen by Vladimir Pozner and that he had made very few changes from the original play. The article was very favorable toward the film and concluded by stating that it was "a film well worth seeing."

A Streetcar Named Desire

[redacted] screen writer and source of information for the Los Angeles Office, mentioned the play currently appearing on the Broadway stage by the name of "A Streetcar Named Desire," which is directed by Elia Kazan. In connection with Kazan, the informant stated, "If he isn't a Communist he should be." According to this informant the above-named play is being praised by the Communists and portrays the decline of the American upper class. He stated that the Communists in this case are adopting a new tactic in their praise of this production, and instead of praising the "true message" of the play are praising the acting ability of the cast. He stated that their reason for so doing is in order not to attract attention to the propaganda in the play. The informant stated that the story deals with two sisters, both of whom belong to a wealthy family, and that when the family loses its money one of the sisters becomes a prostitute in order to retain her financial position and enjoy the luxuries to which she had been accustomed, and the second sister marries a worker from the "gutter." In one scene the worker, a Pole, rapes the sister who later became a prostitute and during this scene she wears a gold dress, which is symbolic of the capitalist regime. He wears red pajamas in this scene and waves them to the audience saying "I will wave this as my banner the day my child is born." The informant stated that this is an indica-

tion of the true Communist doctrine portraying the downfall of the bourgeoisie class. This informant further stated that the fact that this play is being produced by L.B. Mayer's daughter "is the joke of the season among the Communists." He also stated that several of the Hollywood studios are considering the play with the idea of making it into a motion picture.

Body and Soul

[redacted] screen writer and source of information for the Los Angeles Office, reported that although the picture "Body and Soul," starring John Garfield and Lilli Palmer, has Communist Party members as actors in the picture and also had a hand in the picture's production, that it was his opinion that the picture contained no propaganda as such. He advised that the reason for this was the fact that the studio made the picture with the idea of making money, and apparently succeeded. He stated that the production of the picture was a production of the Enterprise Studios, which was practically bankrupt until the picture became a hit and as a result the studio is in a favorable financial position.

Christ in Concrete

In connection with this proposed production [redacted] for Warner Brothers, stated that Dalton Trumbo has been connected with the proposed screen treatment of this picture. Two of the persons who are currently attempting to promote this picture are Adrian Scott and Edward Dmytryk, both of whom are known to have been members of the Communist Party, according to a highly confidential source available to the Los Angeles Office. [redacted] of the Stenographic Department of RKO Studios reported that the persons connected with this picture constitute a regular "Communist nest." The individual actively promoting the production of this picture is Joe Justman, head of the Motion Picture Central Studio, according to [redacted] of the Naussaur Studio and [redacted]

[redacted] Justman reportedly told [redacted] that Dmytryk was not a Communist and would be cleared of the charges of contempt of Congress presently pending against him. According to [redacted] he had participated in a conference with Dmytryk and Adrian Scott, and that Dmytryk had agreed to furnish a handwritten letter to the effect that he was not a member of the Communist Party, which letter would be released at the same time that the picture was released. Scott also advised this informant that some of his best friends were in a position to back this picture financially and that the cast would be comprised of individuals, some of whom agreed to accept their salaries in part in deferred payments depending upon whether or not the picture made good. The

financial set up was to be as follows: Sam Wanamaker, \$60,000.00 with \$50,000.00 deferred; Luisa Rainier, \$50,000.00 with \$25,000.00 deferred; Albert Dekker, \$10,000.00; Joseph Bromberg, \$75,000.00; Rod Geiger, Producer, \$25,000.00 with all deferred; Edward Dmytryk, Director, \$100,000.00 with all deferred. The picture is scheduled to be produced on a \$500,000.00 budget, exclusive of Dmytryk's salary which he is willing to defer "since he is so anxious to make the picture." Of the above individuals mentioned in connection with the financing of the picture, both Bromberg and Dmytryk have been identified as members of the Communist Party by [redacted] a highly confidential source.

Prelude to Night

[redacted] previously identified, reported that the Motion Picture Central Studios had recently completed a picture entitled "Prelude to Night." This informant stated that he had seen several of the rushes of the picture and in his opinion the Communist element was so strong and the propaganda so pronounced that the Studio would lose money on it. As a result of his feelings he refused to attend any of the previews and concluded that the Studio "would lose its shirt on this production." He stated that the screen version was adapted by Dayton Stoddard, and was written for the screen by Robert Rossen and Alvah Bessie. After they had completed the screen version it was again rewritten by Gordon Kahn. Rossen, Bessie, and Kahn, according to Confidential Informant [redacted] are members of the Communist Party.

This informant stated that "The whole theme is anti-capitalist and in spite of the rewritings it could not have been changed much." He stated the Studio had one and a half million dollars invested in the picture and among the stars appearing in it are Zachary Scott, Sydney Greenstreet, Louis Hayward, Diana Lynn, and Martha Vickers.

So Well Remembered

A review of this picture appearing in the "Washington Post" on June 6, 1948, written by Richard L. Coe stated that one Hollywood columnist (easily identified as Hedda Hopper) had criticized this film as "exhibit A of Leftism," and stated that in her opinion there was no instance in which the film had violated the so called Party line. Coe's column stated that the picture had been produced by Adrian Scott and directed by Edward Dmytryk, and that the music had been composed by Hans Eisler.

Coe did not agree with Hedda Hopper's criticism of the picture and stated that in his opinion it was not Communist propaganda.

State of the Union

A review of the picture "State of the Union" written by Lee Mortimer appeared in the New York "Daily Mirror" on April 25, 1948. Among the statements made by Mortimer were the following: "If you think Frank Capra isn't using his movie version of the hit broadway political satire 'State of the Union' now at the Music Hall to peddle some peculiar advanced political thinking you had better take a look. This artful cinematic trickster hawks his propaganda to audiences through two wonderful and irresistible sales persons, Katherine Hepburn and Spencer Tracy, abetted by the masculine charms of that invoker of the screaming neenies in juves, Van Johnson."

"This stuff slipped through the customers by one of the oldest dodges in the game, 'Sure I am against Communism, but---.' The big but here seems to be a deep seated dislike for most of the things America is and stands for. The indictment against this country, its customs, manners, morals, economic and political systems, as put into the mouths of Tracy and Miss Hepburn, would not seem out of place in Izvestia....

"The do-gooders, beondoggiers, long hairs, and others of the lunatic fringe smile happily when Tracy calls for America to distribute the wealth which keep it free to all the peoples of the world....'from Patagonia to the North Pole' so none will have more or less. Is that in our Constitution?....

"They just tell us in passing that he (referring to Tracy) has attacked 'dishonest labor bosses' but his vicious vitriolic tirades against the employers are declaimed in full."

The Judge's Wife

[REDACTED] Universal-International Studios, in February of 1948 reported that the only production then being prepared at Universal-International Studios concerning which the informant had any doubt was one entitled "The Judge's Wife," which starred Frederic March and his wife, Florence Eldridge. The informant reported that this story deals with a stern judge who indulges in two types of justice.

Treasure of Sierra Madre

Los Angeles informant [REDACTED] active paid member of the Communist Party [REDACTED] in referring to the Warner Brothers picture "Treasure of Sierra Madre," stated that Walter Houston makes a speech in the picture which is practically a direct quote from Karl Marx's "Das Kapital."

This informant stated that the speech by Houston deals with the value of gold and is made during a scene in a flophouse in Nogales. The section of Marx's book from which the quote is taken, according to the informant, is that dealing with value, price, and property.

Tucker's People

According to [REDACTED] Producer at Enterprise Studios, a picture entitled "Tucker's People," starring John Garfield had its premier in New York City. This production was produced by R. B. Roberts and was directed by Abe Polonsky, both of whom have been identified as members of the Communist Party by Los Angeles Confidential Informant [REDACTED] previously identified. The informant reported that changes had recently been made in the script and that while it is a story which is depressing, in his opinion "there is nothing in it to cause excitement." The informant stated that there had been a police brutality angle in the story and that while he did not know what would happen to this matter when the picture was finally in production, that the script as it had been rewritten had eliminated that phase of the picture.

Miscellaneous

On March 1, 1948, [REDACTED] New York City, which firm specializes in the production of short features, animated drawings, statistical designs, etc., called at the New York Office of this Bureau to report that he had been contacted by Carl Marzani, former State Department official convicted of concealing his membership in the Communist Party while working for the Government.

Marzani visited [REDACTED] on February 26, 27, and 28, 1948, in an effort to get him to produce twelve motion pictures in connection with the election campaign of Henry Wallace. Marzani stated that he had in his possession between twenty and thirty thousand dollars worth of 16 mm. sound and photograph equipment, and desired [REDACTED] firm to produce pictures for him inasmuch as they could produce such pictures on short notice. According to [REDACTED] his company had recently completed a short entitled [REDACTED] money for which had been furnished by the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America - CIO, and had been put out for the purpose of having price control reinstated. In this connection [REDACTED] stated that his contacts had been made with a man by the name of Max, but that on March 26, 1947, Max had visited [REDACTED] with his "boss," who turned out to be Marzani, whom [REDACTED] had known for several years. During the interview at the New York Office [REDACTED] stated that Marzani is known to him to be a close friend of Laura Hayes and Roslyn Pearlman, co-editors of the United Nations Film Branch. According to [REDACTED] both Hayes and Pearlman are admitted Communists who determine policy and shape

impressions in connection with films issued by the United Nations. The New York Office advised that the indices of that Office reflect that in May of 1945 both Hayes and Pearlman were identified as contributors to the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, but that no other information was available in the files of that Office concerning these two persons.

The March 29, 1948, issue of "Variety" reported that the film industry had been expressing considerable interest in anti-Communist films and that Warner Brothers, in addition to the picture "The Iron Curtain," was planning to do a picture entitled "To The Victor," and also that Edward Sutherland would produce a picture for United Artists entitled "I Was a Communist." It was also reported that Louis DeRochemont would do a picture on Communism for Metro Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, and that Columbia Studios was preparing to do a picture "Portrait of an American Communist," based on a story by John McPartland, which appeared in "Life" magazine. In addition, MGM was also considering producing "The Red Danube," and the article also made the following statement in connection with anti-Communist films, "Theme most avoided now has become hottest to hit screen this year." MGM has revived its picture "Ninotchka" and this is presently being released in Italy. According to [redacted] screen writer for MGM, the production "Portrait of an American Communist" being considered by Columbia Studios has been assigned to Collyer Young to produce. The informant stated that Young was one of the organizers of the Committee for the First Amendment, and that Young had made the statement that two people whom he would guarantee would have no part in the picture were Adolph Menjou and Jack Moffitt (both Menjou and Moffitt appeared as friendly witnesses before the House Committee on un-American Activities investigation in October, 1947). The informant stated that in his personal opinion, Young would probably neutralize the positive effect of this film.

5

IV. COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN MOTION PICTURES
(September 16, 1948, to July 15, 1949)

"Boy With The Green Hair"

With reference to this picture, which was released by RKO Studios, Los Angeles Informant [redacted] in the fall of 1948 advised that this picture had originally been purchased by Dore Schary, former Production Chief at RKO, for Adrian Scott (one of the "Hollywood Ten") but that Scott had been fired by RKO. The story was written by Ben Barzman and Alfred Lewis Levitt, Jr. It was produced by Stephen Ames and directed by Joseph Losey. Of the above, Barzman has been identified as a member of the Communist Party while Losey is suspected of Communist Party membership. According to this informant, Ames was the only one of the above group connected with the production of the picture who was not pro-Communist. The informant stated that the original script of the picture was loaded with Communist propaganda but that Ames and other RKC executives had deleted most of it.

The "Hollywood Reporter" of November 15, 1948, in referring to the preview of this picture at the Pantages Theater, stated that the preview "was the signal for a full local Commy attendance".

The picture also received favorable reviews in the "Daily Worker" of January 13 and January 16, 1949. Among the comments made in these reviews were the fact that Howard Hughes, head of RKO, had been unable "to strip the movie of its message", and that the movie made its point about the fear and ignorance "that operate with intolerance obliquely and by the use of symbols, but it speaks for peace forthrightly." In the review of January 16, 1949, it stated that the boy in the picture who was "reviled and feared by an average American community for the color of his hair, is like an American inhumanly categorized and segregated because of the color of his skin. There is a traceable line between national politics and the esthetics of the movies within reach of the screen; and the politics of a cold war and Negro discrimination dictate to the writers of a social film like 'The Boy With Green Hair' what they shall say and how they shall say it."

"Christ in Concrete"

Information concerning this picture has previously been set out in this memorandum.

The "Daily Peoples' World" of January 27, 1949, stated that a report from London indicated that this picture was again on the production calendar and that a contract had been signed between Rod Geiger and J. Arthur Rank with the

understanding that Sam Wanamaker was to be the star of the picture and it was to be directed by Edward Dmytryk, one of the "Hollywood Ten". The article indicated that a number of individuals from the Actors' Laboratory had been promised parts in the picture by Geiger but it was felt that these promises would not be kept because of the British Government's unwillingness to pay actors in American dollars.

The "Daily People's World" of May 5, 1949, stated that the title of "Christ in Concrete" had been changed and that the new tentative title for the picture would be "In God We Trust".

"We Were Strangers"

With reference to this picture, which was directed by John Huston, produced by S. P. Eagle, and released by Horizon-Columbia Productions, the "Hollywood Reporter" in its issue of April 22, 1949, stated in part: "It is the heaviest dish of red theory ever served to an audience outside of the Soviet -- and the repercussions will not end with this comment. . . . It is Party-line all the way through -- the Americans are shown as nothing but money-grubbers and the down-trodden are urged to revolution to achieve their freedom." The article stated that John Garfield starred in the production and summarized by stating, "When previewed in the Columbia projection room two nights ago, the film ended on a note of embarrassment -- not the usual regret when a picture is a turkey, but because those present felt ashamed that they lacked the guts to stand up before it was over and identify 'We Were Strangers' for what it is -- a shameful handful of Marxian dialectics."

The picture received praise in the "Daily People's World" of April 3, 1949, which described it as one of the pictures which should be entered at the Czechoslovak Film Festival and described it as a "brilliantly conceived picture". This review indicated that the picture was based on an episode in Robert Sylvester's "Rough Sketch" telling of the revolt against dictatorship and the overthrow thereof.

"The Big Knife"

Although not a motion picture "The Big Knife" is a recent play by Clifford Odets which appeared in New York, and due to the relationship with the movie industry and the fact that John Garfield and J. Edward Bromberg, both prominent in the movie colony, were starred therein, it is being included in this section of the memorandum.

The "Daily People's World" of January 20, 1949, stated that "The Big Knife" was the first play in ten years of Clifford Odets and had been directed by Lee Strassberg, described as one of the founders of the Group Theater. This article stated that the play "tells the story of the corruption of a young actor by the forces in play in Hollywood" and that it was expected to be one of the most controversial plays of the year.

The "Daily Worker" of February 28, 1949, set forth a detailed review of the play, which review was written by Barnard Rubin. Among the comments - on this play made by Rubin were the following:

" . . . It is a conscious, if somewhat clumsy blow aimed with deadly intent against the giant film industry -- one of the most powerful instruments the money class has for corrupting the American artist and public...The predominant theme of 'The Big Knife' is that artistic integrity -- the will to help produce a culture of genuine merit for the American people — cannot survive in a Hollywood dominated by Big Money as a profit-making Big Business Institution."

The review closed by recommending the play as one which was eminently worthwhile seeing.

Miscellaneous

With reference to Communist influence in motion pictures themselves, Los Angeles Confidential Informant [REDACTED] stated that Dore Schary was one of the most important men in Hollywood because of the "subsidy he can give to the Party" and that he felt that Schary would hire many Communists and fellow travellers at MGM because he had followed that practice while at RKO.

Following Schary's affiliation with MGM, local trade papers in the Los Angeles area carried stories to the effect that he planned to release a certain number of "message pictures" at MGM.

Los Angeles Informant [REDACTED] advised that Schary would work under the direct guidance of L. B. Mayer and Los Angeles confidential source [REDACTED] former producer at MGM, had stated that it had consistently been Mayer's position that he was not worried about Communist propaganda in motion pictures because he would personally see to it that no such material finally reached the screen. The informant reported, however, that all individuals who knew and recognized Communism in motion pictures and who had previously brought it to Mayer's attention had either been fired or given notice by the studio.

In the fall of 1948 it was learned that Roman Bohnen, who has been identified as a member of the Communist Party, was attempting to market a play entitled, "This Little Pig Went to Market". Los Angeles Confidential Informant [REDACTED] after seeing the play, characterized it as "loaded with propaganda." During the fall of 1948 Bohnen was attempting to obtain financial backing for his play either in Hollywood or New York.

Los Angeles Informant [redacted] in the fall of 1948 furnished publicity for use by "Contemporary Stage", indicating that this organization intended to present legitimate theater in Los Angeles at less than motion picture prices. The first play announced was "Private Hicks", which was written by Albert Kaltz and directed by Karen Morley. The Stage Manager was Burt Holland, the sets were designed by Tom Holland, and one of the members of the cast was Peter Virgo. All of these individuals have been identified as past or present members of the Communist Party. The second play contemplated by "Contemporary Stage" was to be "Waiting For Lefty" by Clifford Odets. The stage settings were to be by Dave Sarvis. Tom Holland was listed as a member of the cast and technical credits were accorded to Martin Perlman. Of the above, Sarvis, Holland, and Perlman have all been identified as past or present members of the Communist Party.

In January, 1949, it was learned that Roberts Productions had certain story properties which it was intending to complete within the next 12 or 18 months and that John Garfield was scheduled to star in one of the pictures. One of the pictures contemplated by Roberts Productions was an original entitled, "Deborah" by Richard Collins, who has been identified as a Communist Party member, and "The Great Indoors" by Ring Lardner, Jr., who is a known member of the Communist Party and one of the "Hollywood Ten". Another contemplated picture by Roberts Productions is an untitled comedy being written by Abraham Polonsky, who has also been identified as a Communist Party member.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lawson, Maltz, Trumbo, Bessie, Daytryk, Waxley, Rosson and Cole are Communists and their Communist affiliations are set out in Section I of this memorandum. Edward G. Robinson has been identified as a Communist by Informant [REDACTED]. Charles Chaplin, according to [REDACTED] may or may not be a member of the Communist Party. However, [REDACTED] stated that Chaplin has always gone along with the Communist Party and has helped them financially. He stated that Chaplin has financed the West Coast Communist newspaper "Peoples World." John Garfield, according to Informant [REDACTED] has been affiliated with the Actors Laboratory, the Young Communist League, Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, Hollywood Democratic Committee and the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee for the Arts, Sciences and Professions. All of the above organizations, with the exception of the Young Communist League, the former youth group of the Communist Party, USA, are discussed in Section III of this memorandum. Garfield has also been identified as a Communist by [REDACTED].

Mikhail Kalatozov, Soviet motion picture representative came to Hollywood in August of 1943, where he endeavored to purchase American films. Among the films he sought to purchase were "Little Foxes" and the "Karl of Chicago." The first of these films depicts a degenerate Southern family, the latter is a story of a Chicago gangster in England. It may well be a part of Kalatozov's plan or propaganda technique to obtain such pictures in order to exhibit American life at its worst to the Soviet people, much in the manner that Adolf Hitler, through his propaganda ministry, tried to convince the German people for several years before the war that the United States was nothing more than a nation of Chicago gangsters.

[REDACTED]

Following Malatov's return to the Soviet Union, his files were turned over to the Vice Consul in Los Angeles. Since that time there have been limited contacts between Soviet diplomatic representatives and motion picture personalities.

In May of 1946, Gregory L. Irsky, formerly of the Amtorg trading Corporation; Leonid Kozmatov, film camera man; and Boris Tolstogowsov, a film technician, came to the United States from the Soviet Union as a commission to study scientific techniques on behalf of the Soviet Union, to arrange for cinematographic equipment and to negotiate for technical assistance in the motion picture field. Informant [REDACTED] of the Production Division for Bell and Howell, motion picture manufacturing company, related that Irsky in his contacts with him indicated that he was endeavoring to disseminate Russian propaganda type films on various phases of Soviet life, such as the Soviet military strength, under the guise of educational features, to American schools and colleges. This project, of course, did not materialize.

[REDACTED]

The Los Angeles papers carried stories reflecting that Konstantin Simonoff held a party aboard a [REDACTED] at the harbor at Los Angeles. Among those who attended this party were Mr. and Mrs. John Garfield, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Chaplin and Lewis Milestone. The Los Angeles

Herald for May 28, 1948, reflected that the Jack Tenney (California State Legislature Un-American Activities Committee) group was going to conduct an investigation of this party. It was reflected that the committee was interested in the elaborate banquet which was provided for the guests---- "While millions are starving in Europe-----providing an ironic touch to the celebration honoring the proletariat."

With regard to Simonov's visit to this country, the June, 1948 issue of the "Screen Writer," which is the official publication of the Screen Writers Guild, carried a transcript of an informal discussion held under the auspices of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization between Simonov and members of the Screen Writers Guild. The informal discussion was presided over by Dalton Trumbo, a Communist, whose Communist affiliations are set out in Section I and who is employed as a screen writer in the motion picture industry.

This article contained a question propounded to Simonov concerning the rights of a writer of his material. Simonov replied that Soviet writers do not sell their work outright to the film industry but rather only sell the right for screening, indicating that the right for publishing the material remains in the hands of the author. It should be pointed out that the Screen Writers Guild is the organization supporting the American Authors Authority, which program, conceived under Communist guidance, calls for the copyrighted and subsequent leasing of screen plays rather than the selling of screen plays to producers.



Artkino Pictures, Incorporated

Artkino Pictures, Incorporated, was chartered in New York on July 22, 1940. It was registered, listing as its foreign principal, Soyuzkino Moscow, USSR.

The organization claims that it is engaged in the importation of motion picture films from Soviet Russia and the distribution of these films in the Western Hemisphere. Although there is no apparent direct connection between Artkino Pictures, Incorporated, and the Communist Party, USA, sever-

of the people associated with the organization have been identified either as members of the Communist Party, Communist Political Association or closely associated with the Communist movement through front organizations.

Rosa Madell, who was listed as Vice President in January of 1947 of Artkino Pictures, Incorporated, is married to Sam Madell, alias Sam Mulfosky. Sam Madell has been reported by several reliable sources, including [REDACTED] and reliable informant [REDACTED] as being actively affiliated with the Waterfront Section of the Communist Party in New York.

Ginger Canor, switchboard operator at Artkino, is believed to be identical with Gertrude Canor, who was born in New York City on February 2, 1925. Reliable informant [REDACTED] a former member of the Communist Party and former confidential informant of the New York Office, reported that Ginger Robeson, believed to be identical with Ginger Canor, was among those present at the Innwood Victory Club of the Communist Political Association on February 6, 1945, at New York City. He also reported that she was among those present at two other meetings of this same Club, one held on December 26, 1944, and the other on January 23, 1945. Nancy Markoff, listed as a telephone operator at Artkino, has been referred to by informant [REDACTED] as a member of the OGPU, presently known as the MGB. At the present time this allegation has not been proven or disproven. However, investigation is being made to determine the exact status of this individual.

V.

SOVIET ACTIVITIES

(October 2, 1947 to February 5, 1948)

Confidential informant [REDACTED] of the Los Angeles Office provided a photostatic copy of a letter written to Eric Johnston from W. B. Smith, American Ambassador to Russia, dated August 7, 1947. This letter to Johnston is quoted as follows:

"THE FOREIGN SERVICE
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"American Embassy, Moscow
August 7, 1947

"Dear Mr. Johnston:

"I have had Mr. Eisenstein, the dean of Soviet film directors, for dinner at Spaso on several occasions and to see the American films with which the industry has so kindly provided us. His comments after the showings were usually non-committal or mildly approbational. Attached is his official reaction, a recent article appearing in 'Culture and Life.'

"It seems to me this demonstrates very clearly, if demonstration were required, the correctness of your stand in opposition to exporting certain films like 'Grapes of Wrath' and 'Tobacco Road' to the Soviet Union unless an equal number of films showing more favorable aspects of life in the United States were also exported.

"Faithfully,

/s/ W. B. Smith

"W. B. Smith
"Ambassador of the United States

- "Encl: Joint Press Reading Service translation:
The Purveyors of Spiritual Poison

"Mr. Eric Johnston, President
Motion Picture Association
28 West 44th Street
New York 18, New York"

There is set out hereinafter the enclosure forwarded by Mr. Smith to Mr. Johnston referred to in the above letter.

"CULTURE AND LIFE

Thursday, 31st July, 1947

"THE PURVEYORS OF SPIRITUAL POISON
About the Contemporary American Cinema.

By S. M. Eisenstein

"The American cinema has produced more than a few ultra-reactionary pictures in the past. We have only to remember a very early film "Birth of a Nation" which celebrated the formation of the Klu Klux Klan, a fascist organization.

"There have also been in the American cinema, however, quite a number of really vital themes treated in a convincing manner, although this was usually contrary to the intention of the makers of the film, and certainly against the wishes of their bosses. But in one way or another there have appeared from time to time on the American screen films giving with unexpected objectivity a true picture of the code of behaviour of the gentlemen of the 'God's own country', as the Americans like to call their United States.

"In the thirties there appeared a film 'The Big House' (the American name for prisons), giving an extraordinarily realistic picture of prison conditions and showing a revolt, and its suppression - with the use of tanks.

"Later came a film 'I was a Fugitive from a Chain-gang', a striking document revealing the injustice and obscurantism of the American legal system, a sinister machine showing no mercy to those who fall into its clutches.

"Films like 'Grapes of Wrath' and 'Tobacco Road' give a picture every bit as clear as the original novels of the ruthless exploitation of the unemployed and the full horror and dark abyss facing the ruined

"small farmers of the Southern states and reducing them to a subhuman condition!"

"Quite recently the cinemas of America were showing 'Boomerang,' a film which reveals with full and accurate detail the backstage machinations pursued by small town politicians in the interests of their small caste, and leading to the passing of the death sentence on an entirely innocent man. The film gives a vivid picture of the methods of interrogation and extortion of confession. 'The law forbids beating during interrogation' says one of the characters, 'but the law says nothing about preventing the man from sleeping', and this means is used to reduce a man to a state in which he is prepared to sign any confession.

"Films of this kind, however, giving a more or less objective picture of the actual state of affairs are becoming rarer and rarer. Their place is being taken by films of quite another type. The American cinema is no longer what it was twenty years ago.

"The time has passed when we could merely shrug our shoulders and smile at the empty irrelevant entertainment provided by American films; or admire, somewhat condescendingly, the exploits of Robin Hood or 'The Thief of Bagdad', or the athletic prowess of Pearl White or Ruffy Rollan.

"The wave of reaction is pressing more and more heavily on the entire life of the country, and its art as well. At the present time the disciples of the Klu Klux Klan are drawing up black lists of all those who, during the war, dared to use the American cinema to address humanity on vital questions. The people on this list will be condemned to unemployment and starvation. Already the black clouds are gathering threateningly over Charlie Chaplin. There are already instances of anti-fascist actors being subjected to merciless baiting; and American films show more and more clearly how progressive elements are being swamped by the wave of reaction and themselves often contain praise of the same fatal reaction. Even 'non-political' American films propagate the poison in subtle form. It is not only those films openly devoted to erotic themes or to the praise of power in the person of gangsters or bandits that have a disintegrating effect.

Whatever hypocritical pretences these films make of exposing gangsters the fact remains that they are a panegyric of the gangsters' shameless methods, persistence in the pursuit of their own selfish interests and utter disregard of everything beyond these interests.

"What else can we expect from the producers of these films? After all, this code of morals, based on plunder and violence is also the code of the 'honest' businessmen, although they sit in the soft armchairs of the directors of firms and companies instead of sitting like ordinary criminals, in the electric chair.

"Even more harmful sometimes are films which are not so obvious in their praise of the basest and most animal instincts of man. The spectator is more strongly affected by a film where the poison is wrapped up in warm humanity, soft humour and touching pathos.

"There are also such 'enchanting' films as 'Going My Way' with a well-known American actor Bing Crosby, which was awarded a prize and advertised all over Europe. Here the nets for the spectators' hearts are so musical and laid so cunningly (it is not for nothing that the hero of the film is an unusually cunning snarer of human souls - a young priest) that it is only after the end of the film that the spectator realises how shamefully he has been participating in the action during the two hours while it has been shown.

"This film cleverly combines humour, a patriotic theme, lyricism and religious singing for the purpose of slurring over the real cause and the tragedy of prostitution and asserting that child delinquency is best dealt with not by changing the social conditions driving the children to crime, but by collective singing in a church.

"And the film as a whole serves as an apologia for the owner of a block of cheap flats making him out to be a benefactor, though this is in fact one of the most repulsive forms of exploitation of the poor classes in America.

"Or there are such 'enchanting' films as 'Anna and the King of Siam' singing unqualified praise of the superiority of the white races over the Siamese semi-apes and of the missionary role played by an American governess who set out to win the savages over to the biblical virtues of humility and love. The action takes place in the sixties of the last century when the Siamese were concentrating all their efforts on asserting their independence against the attempts of England and France to seize Siam in their colonising claws. There is no mention of all this, instead we see a light ironical sometimes moving picture, often dramatic, always witty and apparently quite innocent. But it would be difficult to find more subtle propaganda of the colonial politics which make the average American either indifferent or sympathetic to disgraceful acts now being committed in places so far from Siam as

"Indonesia, in the lawless realm of Field-Marshal Smuts - the Union of South Africa - and the 'independent' Philippines.

"The makers of films are particularly cunning when it comes to dealing with the problem of the relations between employers and employees, whether it be a factory owner and the workers, or a big landowner and his tenants. Films showing clashes between labour and capital now appear fairly frequently on the American screen: reality is too full of these problems and interest in them is morbidly keen. And the American cinema loses no opportunity of expressing an opinion on all questions which interest, trouble or excite the spectator. The spectator is worried over problems of social injustice? All right, here we have this little theme, adapted and effectively treated. The magic hand of the film director makes it harmless whilst preserving the external drama.

"The methods of treatment are many and various. As an example let us take an average horror film 'Dragonwyck', a film about a crime punishable by death. The slightly unbalanced owner of the castle 'Dragonwyck' using a magnolia bush slowly poisons his wives one after another because they are unable to give him their heir he desires. A considerable part of the film, however, is devoted to showing the differences between the owner of vast lands and the semi-beggared tenants working for him.

"The film is interesting because of the topicality of the theme. But how to avoid coming up against the sacred principle of the right to possession of vast areas of land? The answer is very simple. The crime of the owner of the castle attains such monstrous proportions that the typical is lost sight of in the exaggeration of the individual case. The film shows not the evil of the system, but the evil of the individual representative of the system. As a result, the spectator's anger is roused by the fact of a rare screen criminal, and not by the sight of the evil of the system, one completely putting the other out of mind.

"And no one notices that a clever substitution has been made before his eyes: the screen criminal heroically takes the bullet that should have been aimed at the system.

"And at the end of the film the criminal too is absolved of his sins - posthumously. For this purpose he is declared mad which makes it possible to excuse the dastardliness of his crimes and to exaggerate them to a point impossible in real life, thus dissociating them from the actual social system.

"The wolves have eaten their fill, but the sheep are still alive; the spectator has been thrilled by a film on a dangerous contemporary theme. The film earned money. Crime has been shown in the most vivid-colour. Crime has been punished. The basic principal has not been shaken. And the evil doings of which the criminal is 'medically' innocent are expiated by allowing the victim to shoot the criminal.

"The ability to take any theme, even one which in view of conditions in America would appear most slippery and dangerous; not to avoid such a theme but to retain its outward form and by means of exaggeration (or some other means) to reduce it slowly and smoothly to self-destruction and final nothingness - this is probably one of the most cunning characteristics of the American cinema.

"Films of this type give rise to a cynical inhuman attitude to reality. The men behind the Hollywood businessmen aid to deprive the average American of all feelings of honour, to make him cynical and egoistical. This is necessary lest he protest against the violation of laws and justice occurring daily, hourly in America. It is necessary lest there well up in his heart indignation against the betrayal of those who shed their blood in the battle of Stalingrad, on the vast fronts of the Soviet Union where the fate of mankind was decided. At that time the papers, the radio and books all spoke about the Russians as valiant allies. Now all the filthy, dirty, dark elements have come to the surface, so that the muddy water obscures the thought of everything fine, pure and progressive.

"The American cinema is well equipped with the latest filming and projecting apparatus, uses all the latest production technique. On the sets of Hollywood towns, forest, or Egyptian scene can be built in an instant. But this technically advanced cinema is used in the service of ideas only slightly in advance of the stone age. The statue of Liberty at the entry to New York port has long ceased to be a symbol of liberty even for the United States. In 'democratic' America the cinema has become one of the weapons in the fight against freedom and democracy. How far behind us 'advanced' America is lagging! As regards social problems, America belongs not to the 19th century, but rather to the period of the middle ages and the crusade whose bonfires twinkle so familiarly at the bonfires of the lynch courts fed with high-quality petrol.

"The skill, inventiveness and technical mastery of the American cinema are used in the service of darkness and oppression - fundamental characteristic features of the cruelty and unjust system of imperialistic society.

"American films contribute actively to the consolidation of this society by imposing ideas upon the people.

"Thus the most vital of the arts - the cinema - is playing the most deadly and destructive role.

"Then we think of this, it makes us appreciate even more our young, healthy growing art - a vital, national art.

"31.7.47"

"Culture and Life."

V. SOVIET ACTIVITIES IN HOLLYWOOD
(September 16, 1948, to July 15, 1949)

No activity in this field is known inasmuch as the Vice Consulate in Los Angeles was officially closed on January 15, 1948, and all Soviet personnel were transferred from Los Angeles.

()

()

VI. INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY BY
THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The "cuse Committee on Un-American Activities publicly announced on June 20, 1945, that it had voted to investigate subversive activities in Hollywood to determine whether film stars and producers were involved in a plot to overthrow the Government.

It would appear that this decision on the part of the Committee was reached as a result of articles appearing in Los Angeles newspapers following a meeting in the City of Los Angeles on June 8, 1945, sponsored by the "New Masses," a Communist publication, and held in honor of William Gropper, cartoonist for the publication. Principal speakers included Richard Bransten, also known as Bruce Minton, former contributing editor of the "New Masses," and his wife, Ruth McKenney, also a former contributing editor of the "New Masses," as well as Joseph Foster, film editor of "New Masses." With regard to Richard Bransten and Ruth McKenney, it will be recalled that on September 19, 1946, these individuals were expelled from the Communist Party for an unauthorized release of a report on the National Plenum of the Communist Party held in July of 1946.

The Los Angeles papers reflected that the speakers indicated that Communist propaganda and activities in the future would be centered around Hollywood, that Communists were seeking to strengthen their ties with the White House, that pressure must be exerted to continue lend-lease to Russia and that "the thousands of pretty young girls in our Communist Youth Movement must volunteer as hostesses in USO's, canteens, churches, social groups-- wherever the soldiers, sailors, and marines seek recreation and are prone to listen to persuasive voices." The latter quoted statement concerning young girls in the Communist movement appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner. However, the Agents of the Los Angeles Office who were in attendance at this meeting stated that this quotation was an inaccuracy on the part of the paper. The Agents attending the meeting also pointed out that the Examiner made the statement that the program presented had been "carefully blueprinted in New York City by Earl Browder and other American Soviets." No such statement in fact had been made at the meeting.

EX-1
FBI - LOS ANGELES

The Congressional investigation was held as a result, and following the investigation the Committee prepared three confidential reports. The first report contained many blanket statements and conclusions which did not appear to be supported by evidence.

The first section of this report was devoted to the naming of some of the prominent Communists in Hollywood. The second section dealt with the Actors Laboratory, a Communist-influenced group, the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (formerly known as the Hollywood Democratic Committee), the Emergency Committee on KFI, the Anti-Defamation League, the Peoples Educational Center and the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, all of which were referred to as Communist-inspired groups, with brief statements concerning the activities of known Communists connected with these groups.

The next section set forth a list of names of individuals "believed to be" members of the Party in the Hollywood area. Section Four dealt with Communist activities in the various guilds in Hollywood and contained for the most part general statements concerning these guilds.

Part Five entitled "Communists in Labor Unions," was devoted in the main to Herbert K. Sorrell, one of the principal figures in the motion picture industry strikes. Part Six entitled "Russian Government's Interest in Motion Pictures," discussed primarily the visit of Mikhail Kalotozov to Hollywood. Kalotozov, who was in Hollywood during 1943 was a representative of the Soviet Film Industry, Soyuzintorgkino. The motion picture, "Mission to Moscow" was also discussed in this section, particularly with regard to the newspaper comments made concerning it, indicating that the picture was nonfactual and untruthful. The conclusion of the report discussed the aforementioned Communist meeting held in honor of the "New Masses." A considerable portion was also devoted to the alleged trouble that Ivan Levedoff, actor and writer, had in obtaining employment because he was opposed to Communists and Communism.

The second report, which was called a supplemental report, was dated September 28, 1945, and reviewed the publications: "International Theater," said to be an official publication of the International Union of the Revolutionary Committee, published in Moscow, Russia; "The New Theater," an American publication, the organ of the Workers Committee, which was a section of the International Union of the Revolutionary Theater; "International Literature," said to be an organ of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers published in Moscow; and the "T.A.C. Magazine," an American publication sponsored by the Theater Arts Committee. The international and Communist connections of these publications from available copies were reviewed and set out in this report.

The third report, another supplemental report, issued early in

1946, limited its scope to the activities and affiliations of the Communist activities engaged in by the writers employed by Metro-Goldwyn Mayer Studios.

This same Congressional Committee on December 3, 1946, held a preliminary hearing in Los Angeles concerning the Communist activity in the film industry and, according to reports received, only three witnesses were called and the hearings were superficial. The Committee announced, however, that it would return in January of 1947 to conduct extensive hearings on all phases of this type of activity in Hollywood.

The next statement concerning Communist activity in the motion picture industry was made by you in your testimony before this group on March 26, 1947. On this occasion you pointed out that the Communists launched their attack in Hollywood during 1935, directing their activities at the infiltration of labor unions and so-called intellectual and creative fields. You stated that the Communist activity in Hollywood was effective and was furthered by Communists and Communist sympathizers who used the prestige of prominent individuals in the film colony to further their cause. You also stated that the Communists endeavored to insert into motion pictures Communist propaganda and to eliminate anti-Communist statements.

Following your testimony you will recall that Eric Johnston, of the motion picture industry, testified before this Committee. The Washington Post in reference to Johnston's appearance quoted him as stating, "As for there being Communist influence in the movies, such an accusation is absurd. If Hollywood were a Communist network, I should not be attacked every morning in the 'Daily Worker'! -- as I can assure you I am ----."

As you will further recall, Father Cronin telephonically advised Mr. Tamm that Johnston had requested him to draw up a program for the elimination of Communists in the motion picture industry. You will also undoubtedly have noted that Mr. Johnston and his associates have retained former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes. Byrnes, however, is only to act in an advisory capacity concerning the pending Un-American Activities hearings on Communism in the motion picture industry. These actions on the part of Johnston do not show a consistency with his statements as quoted in the Washington Post and referred to above.

Confidential Informant [REDACTED] of the Los Angeles Office, advised that members of the Un-American Activities Committee arrived in Hollywood on May 8, 1947, amid a great fanfare of press releases and headlines, to conduct an inquiry concerning Communism in the motion picture industry

and to ascertain specifically the activities of Hans Eisler, the brother of Gerhardt Eisler, who is employed in the motion picture industry as a writer.

Novelist Rupert Hughes testified before the Committee on May 15, 1947, at which time he stated that Communists dominated Hollywood to a large degree, and specifically mentioned Charlie Chaplin and John Howard Lawson. Jack Warner, Vice President of Warner Brothers Studio, also is said to have testified and complimented the Committee on the work it was doing.

Chairman Thomas of the Committee complimented Adolf Menjou for his enlightening presentation before the Committee, stating that Menjou testified that Communists in the film industry were so powerful that many of the "little people" were afraid to move against them.

Mrs. Lela Rogers, mother of Ginger Rogers, who appeared before the Committee, referred to "The Little Red School House" as being the People's Educational Center in Hollywood and also testified concerning an alleged Communist statement that her daughter refused to say in the motion picture "Tender Comrade."

Robert Taylor also testified, relating that he was forced by Lowell Mellett, former Administrative Assistant to the late President Roosevelt, into playing in a motion picture which favored Russian ideologies over America. The Los Angeles Examiner of May 15, 1947, from which this information was obtained, reflected that Mellett was also affiliated with the Office of War Information as the Director of the Motion Picture Division. The article further reflected that Mellett specifically came to Hollywood for the express purpose of overruling Taylor's objection to appearing in the 1943 release "Song of Russia."

Other individuals prominent in the film world who appeared before the Committee included screen actor Richard Arlen and Henry Ginsberg, Vice President in Charge of Production at Paramount Studios. Viktor Kravchenko, estranged Soviet official, appeared before the Committee and was quoted by the Los Angeles Examiner for May 17, 1947, as having stated that Hollywood was a serious intellectual front in the United States and it was necessary to clear Hollywood of the Communists and Communist sympathizers.

The New York Times of May 17, 1947, quoted Chairman J. Parnell Thomas of the Un-American Activities Committee as asserting after a week of hearings on subversive activities in Hollywood that "ninety per cent of the Communist infiltration" was in the screen writing field, but that the Federal

Government had also abetted the work. He related that in the testimony of fourteen actors, writers, and producers, a very outstanding point that appeared many times was the influence of the "Government in aiding the Communist conspiracy."

The article also reflected that Mr. Thomas stated he reported testimony reflecting that even the White House exerted its influence on certain people in Hollywood to have certain pro-Russian motion pictures filmed during the regime of the late President Roosevelt.

He also indicated that he was not only referring to the incident which came out as a result of the testimony of Robert Taylor, but to other statements made by actors and producers who indicated how the Government persuaded them to put out Communist propaganda in their productions.

On July 21, 1947, it was ascertained that the Un-American Activities Committee had retained the services of former Special Agent H. Allen Smith and A. Bernard Leckie to investigate Communist infiltration of the motion picture industry in the Hollywood area. In connection with this assignment, Mr. Smith called at the Bureau and was interviewed by Mr. J. P. Yohr, at which time he advised that he had been retained by the Committee at the rate of \$25 per day and that his legal associate, former Special Agent A. B. Leckie, would receive \$22.50 per day. Smith related that he had been informed that the objective of his investigation was to line up friendly witnesses and those unfriendly witnesses which the Committee will desire to call. He said it was his purpose to line up approximately 25 or 30 good witnesses who can through proper questioning expose the entire Communist infiltration of the motion picture industry. According to Smith, he gathered the definite impression that he could anticipate considerable pressure to buy him off and to buy off his investigators. He anticipated this pressure would come from Eric Johnston and through sources employed by him. He related that he was informed that two of Johnston's representatives visited the Committee in an effort to find out what the Committee intended to do and how far they intended to go in their investigation of Communism in Hollywood. Smith related that he understood that Congressman Thomas told these representatives he wanted to have nothing to do with them and kicked them out of the office. Smith indicated that he would keep the Los Angeles Office of the Bureau fully informed of his activities and that he is desirous of letting the Bureau know of anything pertinent to our investigations which may come to his attention.

On July 23, 1947, SAC Hood had a lengthy interview with L. S. Mayer of MGM Studios concerning the hearings conducted last spring by the Un-American Activities Committee. According to Mayer, the Committee did itself a great deal of harm by publishing the testimony of Robert Taylor, inasmuch as it was

understood by Taylor and other witnesses that their testimony was to be "off the record." Mayer stated that Robert Taylor was mistaken about the actual facts to which he referred, and Mayer attributed this to Taylor's antagonism toward Communism and related that if necessary he, Mayer, would have to state that Taylor was mistaken. Mayer related that at one time during the war he received a telephone call from Elmer Davis, the head of the Office of War Information, requesting that the film "Mrs. Miniver" be released nationwide as soon as possible in an effort to combat the strong anti-British feeling which was developing in this country. Instead, therefore, of playing large houses in the big cities, which is done with big pictures, it appeared almost simultaneously throughout the country. As a result, the studio's gross was approximately \$6,000,000 less than it would have been had it been distributed in a normal way. He related that sometime later, Government officials were most anxious that some kind of a picture be made to put the Russians in a better light with the American people. Consequently, the film, "Song of Russia," starring Robert Taylor, was made by MGM. Mayer, according to Mr. Hood, could not or would not state exactly who had requested that this film be made. Mayer stated that there were many governmental agencies maintaining liaison with the studio and that he could not recall which one of them handled this particular picture. He stated that he recalled that there was some Communist propaganda in the script as it first appeared and he ordered that all references to collective bargaining and the like be stricken. Mr. Mayer related that he is certain that the film contains no Communist propaganda. Mayer told Lowell Mellett and the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, that he did not care whether they made the picture or not, but if the Government wanted it made and wanted Taylor in it, then it would be necessary that his induction into the Navy Air Service be postponed until the picture could be completed. It was felt that if his Naval induction was held up, he might be inducted into the Army by his Draft Board and, therefore, it was necessary to make a deal with the Draft Board to defer his induction, resulting in Taylor being permitted to remain and the film being produced. Mayer stated positively that this was the real truth of the story, and that Taylor was not ordered by anyone to make the film and he feels that when hearings are held in Washington in September, Mellett's testimony and his, Mayer's, if he is called upon, will make the Committee look ridiculous for having jumped at the publicity on Taylor's erroneous statement.

It is of interest to point out that Mayer was frank to admit to Mr. Hood that he knew there were some Communists in his studio and related that he was willing to discharge all these Communists, but that if he did so his Communist writers would be grabbed up by other studios immediately and paid more money than he is paying them at the present time. This, apparently, was his excuse for having these people on his pay roll.

The Washington Evening Star on July 30, 1947, carried an Associated Press release reflecting the statement made by Representative Nixon, Republican of California, in which he said that the Un-American Activities Committee intends to name names and to produce witnesses who will testify that they have seen persons prominent in Hollywood at Communist meetings and who will report what they said. Nixon related that most of the big stars who may figure in the inquiry will be listed as "tinged with pink, rather than as bright red Communists." According to Nixon, whether any actual Communists or fellow travelers will testify at the hearings, even under subpoena, will develop later. He said that they may follow the Party line of refusing to testify on the grounds that they would incriminate themselves.

The Washington Times-Herald on August 27, 1947, carried a United Press release indicating that former Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles; George Messersmith, former Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Mexico and Argentina; Joseph Saboretti, Assistant Immigration Commissioner; Clarence R. Porter, Chief Inspector of the Immigration Service in Calexico, California; and Mr. P. C. Hutton, Second Secretary and Consul of the United States Embassy at Guatemala City, were to be subpoenaed before the Un-American Activities Committee. Specifically, the Committee, according to the article, wants Welles "and presumably the other four," to explain how and why Hollywood writer Hans Eisler, brother of Gerhardt Eisler, got official permission to enter and remain in the United States.

[REDACTED] the House Committee on Un-American Activities confidentially furnished Special Agent in Charge R. B. Hood of the Los Angeles Office with a list of possible unfriendly witnesses whom the Committee intends to subpoena in connection with the pending hearings of the Committee in Washington, D. C., to be held in the latter part of this month:

Berman, Lionel	Milestone, Lewis or Louis
Bessie, Alvah	Morley, Karen
Cole, Lester	Odets, Clifford
Collins, Richard J.	Ornitz, Samuel
Cromwell, John	Parks, Larry
Dmytryk, Edward	Pomerance, William
Garfield, John	Revere, Ann
Kahn, Gordon	Robinson, Edward G.
Kibre, Jeff	Salt, Waldo
Koch, Howard	Stapp, John
Larner, Ring, Jr.	Stewart, Donald Oden
Lawson, John Howard	Trumbo, Dalton
Maltz, Albert	Tuttle, Frank
McKenney, Ruth	

[redacted] also advised Mr. Hood that the following individuals are intended to be used as friendly witnesses:

Brewer, Roy E.
Chase, Gordon
Cooper, Gary
Disney, Walt
Gibbons, Cedric
Hughes, Rupert
McCarey, Thomas Leo
McGuinness, James
Menjou, Adolphe

Moffitt, John Charles
Montgomery, Robert
Murphy, George
Rand, Ayn
Reagan, Ronald
Rogers, Lela E.
Ryskind, Morris
Taylor, Robert
Wood, Sam

In connection with this pending hearing, [redacted] has confidentially advised Mr. Hood of a recent telephonic conversation he had with Robert Stripling of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. According to [redacted] he was advised that a tremendous amount of pressure had been put on the Committee by all sources, including Congressional, to call off or otherwise influence the Committee's action on this pending hearing into Communism in the motion picture industry. [redacted] related that in his conversation with Stripling, he proposed that the witnesses be called approximately as he has indicated in the schedule prepared by [redacted] for the hearing; however, Stripling was not in complete accord with [redacted] desire in this regard.

Investigator [redacted] has informed Mr. Hood that he is concerned over the procedure and method of operations to be utilized by the Committee in handling the pending hearing. [redacted] has related that he has definitely promised the witnesses from California that they are going to testify along the lines which he has discussed with them. [redacted] related that a great number of the witnesses are worried that the Committee in an effort to create publicity will go off on some tangent. He related that he has tried to point out to Stripling that he wants to give the impression that the inquiry is not one to attack the industry but rather to show that the motion picture industry is being attacked by the Communists. [redacted] related that it is his desire to show that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is endeavoring to expose this Communist activity and thus strengthen the position of the industry.

[redacted] has indicated that he intended to proceed by air to New York on September 18, 1947, and on the following day meet with Mr. J. Parnell Thomas, Chairman of the Committee, as well as other members of the Committee in order to make plans for the hearing. Prior to leaving California, [redacted] furnished Special Agent in Charge Hood of the Los Angeles Office with a copy of a schedule of witnesses which he hopes will be used at the hearing. This schedule is set out in its entirely hereinafter:

"After several discussions between James McGuinness, Morrie Ryskind, A. B. Leckie and H. A. Smith, the following tentative schedule of witnesses has been arranged:

1. Jack L. Warner
Co-Owner, Warner Brothers

Time allowed: $\frac{1}{2}$ day

Comment: From reading Warner's previous testimony, it appears that it is the best that we have, and he can lay a fine pattern of Communism in the industry. He can show the trouble that he had and what he did, and express his wonder as to why the others have not followed his actions. He will call them what they are, and state he threw them out.

Let him say that he is an American and even if he has to suffer financially, he does not intend to have them in his studio, and will continue to suffer financially until such time as he has all Americans. Then, it is interesting to note that last year the Warner Brothers' statement was the best in its history, and it might be that we can bring this in to our benefit. We have not interviewed Warner, and he will not be back until around October 1st, but we are advised that he will not go back on his testimony.

21 Louis B. Mayer
Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer

Time allowed: $\frac{1}{2}$ day

Comment: Mayer can testify regarding 'Son of Russia,' 'Tennessee Johnson,' and the fact that there is no law and until there is a law, he does not feel there is anything particular he can do to Communists. We believe he will say that if there is a law, or if the other studios would get together, he would dismiss them, but he does not want to fire somebody and have another studio get the benefit of it. We think that having Mayer follow Warner will have the psychological effect that Mayer will try to be a better American than Warner.

3. Leo Cherne

Time allowed: 1 hour

Comment: This individual is in New York and his name has been forwarded to Stripling. It is stated that he is very reliable and can lay a general pattern of the development of Communism

*12. Horrie Ryckard
Writer

Time allowed: 1½ hours

Comment: Will discuss the situation in the Screen Writers Guild

13. Borden Chase

Time allowed: 1½ hours

Comment: Will discuss comparison between Screen Writers Guild magazine and the Communist Party line.

** Call a couple more Communists, who should be writers, at this point.

14. John Charles Moffett

Time allowed: 3/4 day

Comment: Will give an analysis of the pictures, following the writers. He might qualify himself by stating that when Gilbert and Sullivan wrote criticisms, they did it as Englishmen, and the Communists criticize everybody on behalf of Communists, and in analyzing the pictures he is keeping in mind Communist Party policies and politics.

15. Rupert Hughes
Author

Time allowed: 2 hrs.

Comment: Can give a general analysis from the writer's standpoint.

16. Lela E. Rogers

Time allowed: 1 hour

Comment: General observations.

17. Cedric Gibbons

Time allowed: 1 hour

Comment: General observations.

** Call a couple of Couple of Communist directors and actors at this point.

18. Gary Cooper
Actor

Time allowed: 1 hour

19. Walt Disney

Time allowed: 1 hour

Comment: In summary, he can state that he believes in Americanism, is against all other 'isms,' and against Communism; Communists will not be allowed in his studio if possible to keep them out, etc.

"20. Leo McCarey

Time allowed: 1 hour

Comment: Concluding witness, from his statements regarding Americanism, that he will not permit Communists in his pictures, etc. Would not make a picture with Hepburn, etc.

Note:

If we call Lewis Milestone as an unfriendly witness, he probably should be subpoenaed just before Cooper, and if we locate Louis D. Lighton and he can testify, we should probably substitute him in place of someone else, possibly Lela Rogers; or let him testify along with Cooper.

One reason for calling Cooper and McCarey the last day is that they are both engaged in a picture, and if we can bring them back together we will save them thousands of dollars.

From the above schedule, we have first the studio heads, followed by the labor and technical experts, followed by actors from the Screen Actors Guild standpoint; then the special incidents of Robert Taylor, "Song of Russia," Wood, and Lowell Millett; followed by general witnesses; then the Screen Writers Guild, the picture analysis, and closing with three witnesses who are very pro-American."

INVESTIGATION OF
COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY
BY THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Activities of "Unfriendly" Witnesses and their Attorneys
or Associates Prior to October, 1947, Hearings

On the morning of October 4, 1947, Rob Silberstein, secretary of the National Lawyers Guild in Washington, D. C., contacted attorney Dave Rein who was co-counsel for Gerhardt Eisler. Silberstein stated that the Guild is seriously considering the organizing of a meeting under the auspices of the Guild's National Committee on Civil Rights and they would discuss the activities of the Congressional Committee from the standpoint of procedure and violation of basic policies. He indicated that this would be followed up by a spokesman of the subpoenaed movie people with such individuals as Ring Lardner, Jr., speaking and former Assistant United States Attorney General O. John Rogge presiding. The tentative date for this meeting was October 17, 1947. Rogge stated that he thought the Progressive Citizens of America was going to have a meeting in this regard. Silberstein advised that the people in California had indicated preference for a non-political forum and in view of this, the Progressive Citizens of America understood that the National Lawyers Guild was considering the meeting and although reluctant, had given up its plans in this regard.

The above information was obtained from [redacted]

The Los Angeles Field Division advised on October 7, 1947, that John Howard Lawson in a discussion with George Pepper, the secretary of the Arts, Sciences and Professions Council of the Progressive Citizens of America stated that Herbert Biberman and attorney Ben Margolis were quite insistent upon having the meeting in Washington prior to the commencement of the hearings and felt that it would lessen its effect to have the meeting after the hearings started. Lawson stated that they had felt so keenly about it that they agreed to hold the meeting tentatively on October 19, 1947. Pepper indicated that Bartley Crum, one of the attorneys for the "unfriendly" witnesses, would appear at the meeting and speak on the topic of "Literature" and that Ring Lardner's topic would be "Mass Media of Communications and Why Reaction Attacks the Artists." Pepper and Lawson discussed the various places at which the meeting in Washington could be held and it was indicated that most probably it would be held in the Press Club.

On October 8, 1947, Dave Rein again contacted Bob Silberstein of the National Lawyers Guild. On this occasion Silberstein inquired if Rein had made any progress with regard to the pending meeting. Silberstein indicated that as soon as they got clearance from Bartley Crum they would proceed. Rein mentioned that when they got all the collective talent together from Hollywood they could put on a little skit of some sort rather than merely have speeches. Silberstein, however, pointed out that all of the people subpoenaed with the exception of one, referring to the "unfriendly" witnesses, were writers. Rein insisted, however, that in view of the Hollywood aspects they should do more than merely say that the Committee "stinks."

The above data were also obtained from [REDACTED]

On the same date Martin Popper of the National Lawyers Guild, who also assisted in a legal capacity the attorneys for the "unfriendly" witnesses, contacted one Abe Unger in New York City. During this conversation, Popper indicated that they would endeavor to secure either Representative Jacob K. Javits or Congressman Adolph Sabath. Also, during the conversation, as possible Congressmen which should be contacted in an effort to have them attend the meeting mention was made of Richard J. Welch of California and Representative George H. Bender of Ohio.

The above information was obtained from [REDACTED]

On October 16, 1947, Bartley Crum in San Francisco conferred with Max Lowenthal, advisor to the American Jewish Conference with offices in New York City, David Wahl and Charles Kramer in Washington, D. C. Lowenthal first contacted Crum and began by stating he understood that when Crum arrived in Washington there was going to be so much going on that they would wish to God they never had heard of this Committee, still less of Crum. Lowenthal inquired whether John (Dierkes?) had sent Carlson something and Crum said it had not arrived as yet. Crum indicated he was flying East tomorrow, would be in Chicago tomorrow morning, and in Washington Saturday noon. Lowenthal inquired specifically concerning Crum's program upon arrival.

Crum explained they were not going to be recalcitrant, not going to be offensive, not going to be defiant. He said they would make a motion to squash the subpoenas immediately on the ground that there was no lawful legislation, and that no (?) legislation can come about as a result of this investigation; secondly, that this is a thought control deal. He stated they were all going to take the oath and remarked he had a hell of a row with the extreme left group and last night made them take the oath of allegiance and pledge to the flag.

Crum continued that on the hearing they would demand open hearings and the right to cross-examine adverse witnesses. Also they were going to demand the right to file statements and would try and make a headline every morning before 11 o'clock. Wahl interrupted to inquire if Crum desired to be met by the press at the plane, and Crum indicated he did.

Lowenthal then volunteered his personal views declaring Crum could throw them (Committee) in the wastebasket and recalled in a previous instance on the Senate side Wendell Willkie had scared the life out of Committee members without doing a really good job. Lowenthal declared this Committee has been set up by Congress to conduct thought control and stated there is no sense trying to attack it on that ground or on the ground of civil liberties.

Lowenthal stated they are so weak and open to attack on grounds which will appeal to the public that if Crum chooses grounds with which the public is unsympathetic, he will throw away a wonderful opportunity. Lowenthal argued Crum's big fight is not at the time of the hearings at all but must be before the hearings. He stated Crum will have to make the issues for the press and should take the offensive before the hearings begin.

Lowenthal told Crum he should get off the plane and Wahl would have a few people to meet him. He suggested that Crum would have to do something in the beginning and should not go into detail but make it very short advising them (press) that he would have plenty more to say at a conference for the press, probably on Monday. Max Lowenthal said Crum should take the gloves off and say these guys should be removed from Congress, and this is one of Crum's principal purposes in coming to Washington to present the facts on that.

Lowenthal continued on Monday at a press interview Crum should present some of the movies in which the witnesses participate, not the whole list, but three or four. Crum commented they have the whole list of everything. Lowenthal observed they are completely American in the American tradition and what the Committee is trying to do is interfere with this industry telling it how it should operate. He said they are trying to set up a Congressional board of censorship which is an interference with private American enterprise.

Lowenthal continued Crum should consider a further press interview on Thursday. He counseled taking up the question of the Committee and what they have failed to do and mentioned material is being prepared for Crum now.

Lowenthal said two members of that committee are on the Tax-Exempt Affairs Committee and have bottled up a situation. He said that there are a couple of men on the Committee are on the House Committee on Banking and Finance which has to do with housing and they haven't done a damn thing about that. Instead, they take a hundred and fifty-day holiday and run off a little bit of a fiasco of this kind. Further, they have a few other points like that, all indicating these tax-exempt Congressmen should be removed.

Lowenthal mentioned he had a lot of stuff for Crum, and that John (Pierkes) had sent him some stuff. Lowenthal said he was meeting John tonight and also meeting another guy in New York tonight who may have to come down here. Lowenthal said he would be back Sunday night or Monday.

Lowenthal again referred to the legal motions Crum had mentioned and stated he does not think very well of these motions, that they are small stuff and will get him absolutely nowhere, and if he has not won his battle by that time, he is licked.

Lowenthal observed the Committee may be unwilling to allow Crum to have available the necessary facilities to enable the public to know what's going on including television, radio, movie tape, cameras, etc. He urged Crum not to ask for a damn thing but if we allow them to have and produce them "private" talk to show all the facilities for getting the facts to the public are proper and if any are excluded the newspaper boys will write the necessary stories. Crum remarked the cameras men are already on their way. Lowenthal said when the men go into action the Committee will be scared to death and every flash bulb which goes off will look like a bomb.

Lowenthal further suggested at the second or third press conference prior to the hearings Crum should have present a committee of actors and actresses. Crum advised Lowenthal that David Selsnick, Katherine Hepburn, and a group of about ten others of similar status are going cast and want to know why they have not been subpoenaed. Lowenthal indicated they should be at his press conference after Crum said they could be working with him. Lowenthal said they want to be helpful giving him the story.

In concluding, Lowenthal advised Crum he was going to help him in all he could but wanted Crum to bear in mind that in his talks with Crum only one other person was present and that was Steve (Soly) and he does not want anyone else to learn about it.

The above information was obtained from [REDACTED]

The Los Angeles Office received a photostatic copy of a memorandum dated October 16, 1947, which was being circulated among various executives of the motion picture industry in the form of a petition. This memorandum was furnished by Confidential Informant [REDACTED] motion picture executive, who stated that David O. Selznick and John Huston were the persons behind this activity. With regard to Selznick, [REDACTED] said that he "is as far to the right as you will find anyone in this business." [REDACTED] stated that he felt that this memorandum was the work of Selznick personally because of the wording and the manner in which it was set out. According to [REDACTED] he was also asked to sign this document and to subscribe to its principles but he refused by stating that he was a member of a group which has its own campaign currently going forward in connection with the Congressional hearings and his group hopes for exposition of every communist in Hollywood.

[REDACTED] said that he also did not agree with the document because "I have every moral and legal right to get rid of Communists working in my studio." He said that he sees no "point in putting the Committee against the FBI" in connection with the investigation of Communism. He was of the opinion that the wording in the memorandum, "I resent the careless hurling of the word 'Communist' at every left wing member of the Democratic party and even its more radical-splinter groups," is an error and that in so far as he was concerned "the Communist spearheads are those groups which are far to the left."

Confidential Informant

[REDACTED] (an actors agency organization), advised on October 17 that John Huston was at his home for dinner and was discussing his activities in connection with the Republican and Democratic Joint Committee of Hollywood. Huston asked [REDACTED] to subscribe to the principles of the aforementioned memorandum. [REDACTED] declined, giving reasons similar to those of [REDACTED] related that allegedly a committee of 15 is actually doing the work in connection with this enterprise and that Huston told him the Screen Directors Guild, with 3 or 4 exceptions, voted to lend its name to the activity.

The Screen Actors Guild under the leadership of Ronald Reagan, actor, refused to become a part of the program and when Emmet Lavery, former head of the Screen Writers Guild, was contacted for his stand, he was noncommittal, neither giving approval or disapproval of the project.

The above referred to memorandum dated October 16, 1947, is set out hereinafter.

"October 16, 1947

"We, the undersigned Republicans and Democrats of the motion picture industry, deplore the fact that Hollywood is about to face another Congressional investigation without proper organization against implications which, based upon all the signs, can be seriously damaging to every individual in the industry, and to the industry itself.

"We question the nature of these investigations, without questioning the privilege of the Congress to make them. We feel that changes in the nature of these investigations are clearly indicated, if basic and fundamental American rights are to be preserved. We believe that the obvious transgressions against these rights include the inability of witnesses to make statements in their own behalf; to be represented by their own counsel; and to have privilege of cross-examination.

"We do not believe that it has ever been the intention that Congressional investigations should take on the aspects of star chamber examinations; or that they should be conducted in a manner akin to proceedings under Fascistic and Communistic regimes abroad; or that they should assume the characteristics of trials, much less trials in which the investigators act as accusers, prosecutors and judges.

"We believe it to be high time that the American people were roused to demand a correction of these un-American practices; and we believe further that until these abuses are corrected, it behooves the people of the motion picture industry to organize in defense of the reputation of themselves and their craft, and the sacred American liberties of the individual and of all media of expression.

"Since this statement is prompted by an investigation into alleged Communism in the use of the motion picture screen, we wish to make clear that we are not making this statement in the belief that there are no Communists in Hollywood. We assume that there are some here as there are everywhere, but if so they constitute an insignificant minority, the parallel of which is to be found in every American industry and in every American medium. We see no reason, other than the political capital and headlines which are to be secured from the seemingly easy target of Hollywood and its people, for singling out the motion picture industry.